

# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

---

HEARINGS  
BEFORE  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION  
ON  
H. R. 361, H. R. 1707, H. R. 2076, H. R. 2991,  
H. R. 3201, H. R. 3845, H. R. 4044, H. R. 4842,  
H. R. 4925, H. R. 4935, H. R. 5001, H. J. Res.  
178, and a Committee Print  
BILLS TO PROVIDE FOR AN EMERGENCY  
IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

---

MAY 21, 22, JUNE 8, 9, 10, AND JULY 9, 1953

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

Serial No. 4



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1953

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

CHAUNCEY W. REED, Illinois, *Chairman*

LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania  
CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey  
KENNETH B. KEATING, New York  
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Ohio  
EDGAR A. JONAS, Illinois  
RUTH THOMPSON, Michigan  
PATRICK J. HILLINGS, California  
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, Jr., Indiana  
WILLIAM E. MILLER, New York  
DEAN P. TAYLOR, New York  
USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota  
GEORGE MEADER, Michigan  
LAURENCE CURTIS, Massachusetts  
JOHN M. ROBSON, Jr., Kentucky  
DEWITT S. HYDE, Maryland

EMANUEL CELLER, New York  
FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania  
THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts  
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio  
FRANK L. CHELF, Kentucky  
J. FRANK WILSON, Texas  
EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana  
JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee  
PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey  
WOODROW W. JONES, North Carolina  
E. L. FORRESTER, Georgia  
BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado  
HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts  
SIDNEY A. FINE, New York

BESSIE M. ORCUTT, *Chief Clerk*  
VELMA SMEDLEY, *Assistant Chief Clerk*  
WILLIAM R. FOLEY, *Committee Counsel*  
MALCOLM MECARTNEY, *Committee Counsel*  
WALTER M. BESTERMAN, *Legislative Assistant*  
WALTER R. LEE, *Legislative Assistant*  
CHARLES J. ZINN, *Law Revision Counsel*

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1

LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*  
RUTH THOMPSON, Michigan  
PATRICK J. HILLINGS, California  
EMANUEL CELLER, New York  
FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania  
WALTER M. BESTERMAN, *Legislative Assistant*

# CONTENTS

	Page
Text of the committee print .....	1
THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1953	
Testimony of Hon. Walter Bedell Smith, Acting Secretary of State .....	5
FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953	
Testimony of and statements by—	
John B. Trevor, president emeritus of the American Coalition .....	39
Nicholas G. Caranfil, chairman, Romanian Welfare, Inc. ....	40
Hon. Martin P. Durkin, Secretary of Labor .....	40
Hon. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture .....	47
Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Assistant Director for Refugees and Migration, Office of the Director of Mutual Security .....	50
MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1953	
Testimony and statements by—	
John W. Voller, president, and Rev. Martin A. Krizka, chaplain, National Alliance Czech Catholics, Chicago, Ill. ....	63
Richard Dee, president, Columbus Alliance, Inc., Bronx, N. Y. ....	63
Mrs. Edward W. Macy, president, Young Women's Christian Association .....	64
Joint statement by the American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, National Council of Jewish Women, and United Service for New Americans. ....	64
Hon. A. R. Mackey, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, accompanied by L. Paul Winnings, General Counsel .....	65
Hon. Joseph L. Carrigg, Representative in Congress from the State of Pennsylvania .....	79
Documents inserted in the record by Hon. Emanuel Celler, Repre- sentative in Congress from the State of New York .....	82
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director, War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference .....	101
Additional documents inserted in the record by Hon. Emanuel Celler, Representative in Congress from the State of New York .....	107
Dr. Paul C. Empie, National Council of Churches and National Lu- theran Council .....	110
TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1953	
Testimony and statements by—	
Walter J. Mason, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor .....	119
The Tolstoy Foundation of New York, N. Y. ....	122
Walter P. Reuther, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations ..	124
Letter from R. A. Elliott, director, immigration services, Department of Church World Services, National Council of the Churches of Christ .....	125
Letter from Amerigo D'Agostino, New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation .....	126
L. H. Pasqualicchio, national deputy, the Order Sons of Italy in America .....	127
Hon. Jacob K. Javits, Representative in Congress from the State of New York .....	129

Testimony and statements by—Continued	Page
Mr. Crete Anderson, chairman, subcommittee on immigration and naturalization of the national Americanism commission, the American Legion, accompanied by Clarence H. Olson, assistant director, national legislative commission, the American Legion.....	134
The Reader's Digest, The Truth About the Immigration Act, May 1953.....	140
Charles E. Babcock, accompanied by James L. Wilmeth, representing the Junior Order of United American Mechanics.....	152
Madelene D. Leetch, legislative chairman, National Society of New England Women.....	157
Doris Dennison, general board of education, The Methodist Church.....	158
Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director, National Lutheran Council, U. S. A. National Committee for Lutheran World Federation.....	158
Merwin K. Hart, president, National Economic Council, Inc.....	159
Merritt B. Curtis, national secretary, National Sojourners, Inc.....	165
Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress.....	166
Mike M. Masaoka, Washington representative, Japanese American Citizens League.....	166
Louis Segal, general secretary, Farband, Labor Zionist Order.....	169
Teresa K. Wunderlich, president, Pittsburgh Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.....	169
Serge Belosselsky, vice president and representative in Eastern United States, Federation of Russian Charitable Organizations of the United States.....	170

## WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1953

Testimony and statements by—	
Hon. Paul A. Fino, Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	171
Catholic Committee for Refugees, New York, N. Y.....	172
Letter from Mrs. James C. Lucas, executive secretary, national defense committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.....	174
Letter from the Very Reverend M. J. Doyle, the Toledo Catholic Charities.....	175
Telegram from Leon Doumbadze, chairman, Caucasian Relief Society, New York City.....	175
Letter from Rev. Thomas B. Lappan, diocesan resettlement director, Diocesan Resettlement Council for Displaced Persons, Pittsburgh, Pa.....	175
Letter from Rev. Victor Suren, diocesan resettlement director, St. Louis Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons.....	176
Letter from Mr. Ray Gibbons, and statement of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, New York City.....	176
Letter from Rev. John W. Keefe, director, Albany Diocesan Resettlement Bureau for Displaced Persons, Albany, N. Y.....	176
Letter from Mr. Vintila V. Bratianu, acting chairman, and Dr. Miron Butariu, secretary, executive board, Association of Free Romanians in the United States of America, secretariat, New York, N. Y.....	178
Letter from Fern M. Colborn, secretary, social education and action, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, New York, N. Y.....	178
Letter from Mr. J. Rice Gibbs, chairman, Immigration, American Defense Society, Inc., New York, N. Y.....	178
Letters from Mr. Lawrence B. Larsen, secretary of convention, diocese of New York.....	179
Letter from Elizabeth M. DeMaris, executive director, Young Women's Christian Association of Brooklyn, N. Y.....	180
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Philadelphia chapter, Philadelphia, Pa.....	180
Mr. Myron W. Fowell, Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society, Boston, Mass.....	180
Letter from Mrs. W. D. Leetch, National Society of New England Women, Washington, D. C.....	181



Testimony and statements by—Continued	Page
Letter from Doris Dennison, the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn..	182
Hon. Juvenal Marchisio, the American Committee on Italian Migration, New York, N. Y.....	182
Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, honorary secretary for the American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia, Pa.....	196
Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Representative in Congress from the State of New York; also testifying for Hon. Isidore Dollinger, Hon. Sidney Fine, Hon. Lester Holtzman, and Hon. Arthur Klein, Representatives in Congress from the State of New York.....	203
Mr. John Cervase, executive secretary, Columbian Civic Club of New Jersey.....	204
Mr. James Finucane, associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War.....	210
Rt. Rev. Msgr. Felix F. Burant, president, Polish Immigration Committee.....	219
Mr. Andrew E. Rice, executive director, American Veterans Committee.....	224

THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1953

Testimony of—	
Hon. Walter H. Judd, Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.....	227
Mr. Herve J. L'Heureux, Supervising Consul General, Bonn, Germany..	239



# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a. m., in room 346, Old House Office Building, Hon. Louis E. Graham (chairman), presiding.

Present: Mr. Graham, Miss Thompson, Messrs. Hillings, Reed, Crumpacker, Celler, Walter, Wilson, Willis.

Also present: Mr. Walter M. Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let the record show that hearings are being held on a group of bills pending before the subcommittee, to wit: H. R. 2076 by Mr. Celler; H. R. 4842 by Mr. Carrigg; H. R. 1707, by Mr. Addonizio; H. R. 3845, by Mr. Rodino; H. R. 4925, by Mr. Bosch; H. R. 4044, by Miss Thompson of Michigan; H. R. 3201, by Miss Thompson of Michigan; H. R. 2991 by Mr. Walter; House Joint Resolution 178 by Mr. Ford; H. R. 4935, by Mr. Javits; H. R. 361, by Mr. Addonizio; H. R. 5001, by Mr. Graham.

The bills will be included in the record by reference.

We have before us a committee print which we would no more consider confidential, and we will have it printed in the record at this point. The witnesses are welcomed to address themselves to it.

(The committee print referred to follows:)

[Committee Print, May 15, 1953]

[H. R. —, 83d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To authorize the issuance of two hundred and forty thousand special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Migration Act of 1953".*

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

(a) "Escapee" means any person who, during or after World War II has left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area of Europe, including those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion refuses to return thereto and who has not been firmly resettled.

(b) "German expellee" means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, western sector of Berlin, or in Austria who was born in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, or areas provisionally under the administration or control or domination of any such countries, except the Soviet zone of military occupation of Germany, and who has not been firmly resettled.

(c) "National" as used in this Act shall mean a person owing permanent allegiance to, and having full rights of citizenship in, a State as of the effective date of this Act.

#### SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS; NUMBERS

SEC. 3. There is hereby established a special quota of two hundred and forty thousand which may be used as provided by section 4 of this Act, during the two years beginning one hundred and twenty days after the enactment of this Act, for the issuance of immigrant visas to aliens seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and their unmarried children under twenty-one years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren, if accompanying them: *Provided*, That sections 201, 202, and 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175-178), shall not be held to be applicable to any alien to whom an immigrant visa shall be issued under this Act: *And provided further*, That no alien shall be issued a visa under this Act and no such alien shall be admitted into the United States unless he is eligible under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163), except as specifically provided in this Act.

#### ALLOCATION OF SPECIAL QUOTA VISAS

SEC. 4. (a) Special quota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this Act shall be allotted as follows:

(1) Not to exceed one hundred and ten thousand visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(2) Not to exceed fifteen thousand visas to escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(3) Not to exceed seventy-five thousand visas to nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph.

(4) Not to exceed twenty thousand visas to nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in Greece: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in Greece.

(5) Not to exceed twenty thousand visas to nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this Act in metropolitan Netherlands: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in metropolitan Netherlands.

(b) The allotments provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the issuance of immigration visas to the spouses and children, referred to in section 3 of this Act, of persons defined in subsection (a) of this section.

#### EMERGENCY MIGRATION COORDINATOR

SEC. 5. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act—

(a) the Emergency Migration Coordinator, hereinafter referred to as the "Coordinator" shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a rate of compensation not in excess of \$17,500;

(b) the Coordinator may exercise any power, function, or authority conferred upon him by this Act through such agencies, officers, or employees of the United States as he shall designate, appoint or employ, utilizing to the maximum extent practicable the services of existing agencies, officers, or employees of the United States;

(c) any funds authorized to be appropriated hereunder may be allocated by the Coordinator to any agency and such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with authority granted hereunder or under the authority governing the activities of the agency to which such funds are allocated;

(d) the Coordinator is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this Act; and

(e) the Coordinator shall report to the President and the Congress on the operations of the program established under this Act at the end of each of the two years of such program. Such reports shall include full and complete

details respecting the administration of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purposes provided in section 14 of the Act including the names of the persons and organizations to whom loans shall be made and the amount of such loans.

#### ASSURANCES; GOOD FAITH

SEC. 6. (a) In accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 (d) of this Act assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States and submitted to the Coordinator. Such assurances shall state that persons who qualify under section 4 of this Act, but not their spouses and children, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment, and that any such person and his spouse and children who propose to live with him will not become public charges, and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing.

(b) No visa shall be issued to any alien whose admission under this Act is based on the submission of an assurance made under subsection (a) of this section, unless he shall first execute a signed statement under oath or affirmation that he accepts and agrees in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided for him in the assurance upon which his application for a visa under this Act is based. The responsible consular officer is hereby authorized and empowered to administer such oath or take such affirmation for this purpose and to designate employees who shall have power to administer such oath or affirmation: *Provided*, That upon a finding by the Attorney General that such statement was falsely made it shall be deemed to be a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as provided for in section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183): *Provided further*, That in determining whether or not the person accepted and agreed in good faith to abide by the said terms of employment the Attorney General shall consider the manner, conditions, extent, and duration of the person's employment after admission into the United States. Such alien and any alien found to have been inadmissible under the provisions of this Act at the time of entry shall, irrespective of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided by sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208-214).

(c) Neither subsection (a) nor (b) of this section shall have applicability if the alien provides satisfactory evidence under the Immigration and Nationality Act that he will not become a public charge.

(d) Assistance rendered an alien in connection with his transportation to and resettlement in the United States shall not be regarded as a cause for excludibility as an alien likely to become a public charge.

#### INTERGOVERNMENTAL ARRANGEMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of State may, for the purposes of this Act, make such arrangements with foreign governments as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of financing and insuring the voluntary movement of migrants, such arrangements to be mutually beneficial to the economies of the United States and the countries concerned, as well as to the individual migrants and their families. Such arrangements, where appropriate, may seek to enable immigrants under this Act to transfer into dollar currency personal assets necessary for defraying the cost of transportation and for use in the United States. Arrangements between the United States and the other governments concerned should also provide for such cooperation and assistance as may be required in the administration of the program authorized under this Act in the territory of the intending immigrant's residence.

(b) The Secretary of State may also make such arrangements with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration as are necessary and appropriate for the purpose of facilitating the transportation of aliens receiving visa under this Act to the port of entry in the United States.

#### SELECTION WITHOUT DISCRIMINATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Within the categories established in section 4 of this Act the determination of the eligibility of persons to receive visas and of the admissibility of such persons into the United States under this Act shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against race, religion, or national origin of such persons.

## EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

## EXEMPTIONS FROM VISA FEES

SEC. 9. Persons receiving visas under this Act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230-231).

## SECURITY AND OTHER INVESTIGATION; EFFECT OF MISREPRESENTATION

SEC. 10. No alien shall be issued a visa under this Act, or be admitted into the United States, unless there shall have been first a thorough investigation by such agency or agencies of the Government of the United States as may be designated by the President regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this Act. Any person who shall willfully make a material misrepresentation to any agency of the Government entrusted directly or indirectly with the administration, investigation, enforcement, or any other function relating to the implementation of this Act, for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an alien eligible hereunder, shall be excluded from admission into the United States under section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 183); and no person shall be issued an immigrant visa or be admitted into the United States under this Act, if the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State or the consular officer or immigrant officer knows or has reason to believe that the alien is subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws or is not eligible under the terms of this Act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall remove the right of review and appeal available to aliens under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

## PRIORITIES

SEC. 11. Priorities in the consideration of visa applications under this Act, without priority in time of issuance of visas as between such priorities or as between priority and nonpriority cases under this Act, shall be given to—

(1) persons who are farmworkers and persons whose services or skills are needed in the United States, if such need has been certified to the Coordinator, by the United States Department of Labor; and

(2) persons who are the blood relatives of citizens or lawfully admitted alien residents of the United States, such relationship in either case being within the third degree of consanguinity computed according to the common law.

## PERSONS INELIGIBLE; OATH ON ADMISSION; PENALTIES

SEC. 12. (a) No visa shall be issued under this Act to any person who personally advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin.

(b) Before being issued a visa every alien eighteen years of age or older, authorized to be admitted under this Act, shall take and subscribe an oath or affirmation that he is not and never has been a person specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), or (H) of section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 184-186), except as provided in subparagraph (I) of such sections, and shall be liable to prosecution for perjury if such oath or affirmation is willfully false. If any alien not entitled to be issued a visa under this Act and not entitled to be admitted into the United States shall nevertheless gain admission, such alien shall, regardless of the date of his entry, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 208-214).

(c) Any person or persons who knowingly violate or conspire to violate any provision of this Act shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$10,000 or shall be imprisoned not less than two or more than ten years, or both.

## APPLICABILITY OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

SEC. 13. Except as otherwise provided by this Act all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable under this Act.

## LOANS

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Coordinator is authorized and directed to make loans not to exceed \$10,000,000 in the aggregate, to public or private agencies for the purpose of financing the ocean transportation and the reception and transportation from ports of entry within the United States

to the places of their resettlement, of persons receiving immigrant visas under this Act, and who lack resources to finance the expenses involved. Such loans, which shall mature not later than June 30, 1960, shall be made under rules and regulations approved by the Coordinator.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Coordinator such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. Also included in the record, by reference, will be hearings held by this subcommittee in the 82d Congress on H. R. 7376, by Mr. Celler, which hearings were printed and a supply of the print is available.

Our first witness today is the Acting Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith.

#### STATEMENT OF GEN. WALTER BEDELL SMITH, ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE, ACCOMPANIED BY MR. GEORGE L. WARREN, ADVISER ON REFUGEES, DANIEL L. HOROWITZ, LABOR ADVISER, BUREAU OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, GEORGE O. GRAY, CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON, AND EDWARD MANEY, VISA DIVISION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the President, in his letter of April 22, 1953, recommended immediate action on emergency measures to meet some very specific and pressing migration problems. The committee print which is before you now is intended to provide such action. A study of the print has convinced the State Department that it makes a substantial contribution toward meeting the needs described by the President. This is a program of interest to a number of Government departments upon whom will fall certain responsibilities in connection with its implementation.

It interests the State Department primarily from a foreign policy point of view. It will have a most favorable effect upon our relations with the hard-pressed free countries of Europe. It will, moreover, assist in relieving problems of a type which could, and almost certainly would, adversely affect the national security of the United States and the entire defense pattern we have been so laboriously building up.

In the postwar period two types of legislation have been enacted in Congress on the subject of immigration. The one has been the setting forth of broad outlines of—and precise instructions on—general immigration policy, designed to guide American officials concerned with the admission of aliens into the United States. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 is one piece of legislation of this type. This proposal is not directed toward changing that act. In fact the program it provides for would operate within the framework of the general existing legislation. The other type of legislation of this subject enacted in the postwar period has been concerned with specific situations. And I have in mind the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by which the Congress successfully assisted in providing for some 350,000 refugees who had found themselves in Germany, Austria, and Italy prior to January 1, 1949. As I well know, some of you on the platform are pretty thoroughly familiar with that because I saw some of you there.

We are now, however, faced with problems which have an important impact upon the health and stability of friendly countries in

Europe. These are problems arising in part out of the war and in part out of totalitarianism. They are problems both of population pressures and of escapees, escapees from persecution. And they are creating situations in certain parts of Europe which gravely endanger the objectives of American foreign policy. It is for that reason that the State Department is so vitally concerned in the matter.

Mr. WALTER. General Smith, would you object if I would ask a question at this point? Who are these people, these escapees?

General SMITH. Well, for that, sir, I will have to turn back. It will be covered later on.

Mr. GRAHAM. And may I suggest that the General proceed and we will do the questioning later on.

General SMITH. If I may finish the statement, Mr. Walter, that happens to be a question which I asked myself when I was being the Devil's advocate with these gentlemen and if you will let me ask it and answer it, I will do that immediately after concluding this statement.

Pressures from basic overpopulation have increased tremendously since the beginning of World War II, during which European migration practically ceased. The postwar refugee problem including those Germans expelled from their homes in areas of Communist domination in Eastern Europe and that steady stream of persons fleeing to the west from the terrors of Communists has intensified population pressures to critical proportions in Western Europe.

A considerable effort has been made by most of the nations of the free world to assist in alleviating this situation.

For example, 22 governments, including those of the United States, Australia, Canada, Israel, as well as 12 Western European and 6 Latin-American countries, have worked through the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, ICEM, to help meet this problem. I think that the United States can be proud of the leadership it has offered in this organization, which proposes to move 120,000 persons out of Europe in calendar year 1953 and 140,000 in 1954. It has been a great humanitarian gesture as well as has other advantages that I have cited.

In the postwar period various countries have participated substantially in receiving migrants from Europe. It is estimated that annually some 350,000 migrants are moving from Europe to overseas countries. Since 1945, Canada, for example, has admitted approximately 775,000 migrants from Europe. During the same period Australia has taken 720,000. The Latin-American countries have received approximately 125,000 annually from Europe. It is hoped that under the leadership offered by the United States, the other nations will make even greater efforts to increase their level of immigration from Europe.

The problem to which the President's recommendation and the committee print is addressed is one which has greatly concerned both this Government and our North Atlantic Treaty allies because all members of the NATO Council have been and continue to be deeply concerned with migration problems. The President's letter of April 22, 1953, with its offer of hope for our allies has received wide praise among the foreign ministers assembled for the North Atlantic Council meeting in April this year.



It is of the greatest importance to the west to reduce some of the backlog created during the war years and recently aggravated by escapees from countries and areas under Communist domination. The pressure of surplus populations and of escapees creates serious economic, social, and political problems for our Western European partners. And not the least serious is the aggravation of economic conditions of a kind which encourage the growth of communism. I have said many times it is oversimplification to say that no man who owns two shirts is a Communist but that has something to do with it because it is in the cold back and the hungry belly that the germ seems to breed. The chief burden lies upon the individual countries affected, and they have made great strides in absorbing into their own economies as large a proportion of the backlog as they could. But their resources are limited. Later on, I will cite you West Germany as one example. They cannot manage the entire problem alone. Only with the assistance of adequate emigration opportunities can the population pressures in these countries be reduced to the point where they are tolerable and can be handled on a continuing basis within their own borders.

The program provided for in the committee print seeks to meet both a general and a specific problem, one in the area of refugees, escapees, expellees, and one in the field of overpopulation. And it seeks to meet them within the framework of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The security provisions of this act will be fully complied with. The screening process will, in fact, be even more rigorous than that which applies under normal immigration requirements, for the program in order to protect the American labor market from undue overcrowding, adds to the requirements already set forth in the Immigration and Nationality Act. On this point the Labor and Agriculture Departments will describe to you the process by which migrants under this program will have been assured of suitable employment prior to the issuance of a visa and will testify on the impact of the program upon the domestic economy. Those, of course, are matters which are of the greatest importance to you.

The program does not represent any attempt to alter or amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is a temporary measure designed to meet an emergency situation, providing for 240,000 special-quota immigrant visas.

Over the 2-year period, the proposed program would enable us to issue special quota visas to 110,000 escapees and expellees now crowded into the western zones of Berlin, Western Germany and Austria. The committee print defines an "escapee" as anyone who has left the Soviet Union or other Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied areas of Europe and has refused to return to these areas. Persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions is the established yardstick. An "expellee" is any person of German ethnic origin, expelled from Eastern Europe, who is now residing in Berlin, Western Germany or Austria. Both in the case of the escapee and in the case of the expellee, only those who are not firmly resettled are eligible.

Western Germany has been able to absorb considerably over 8 million people who, as expellees and escapees from communism, have been added to its population and which has been added to the population of that already crowded area. The large numbers which

cannot be absorbed have in recent months been augmented considerably by the stream of those who have been fleeing west from the oppressive heel of totalitarianism. Similarly a flow of East European escapees have added to the problem in Austria.

Another 15,000 special-quota visas would be made available for escapees from communism now in the European territories of our NATO partners, including Turkey, and in Trieste. Here again, we would be offering hope to those who have braved the terrors of Communist frontiers in a perilous quest for freedom.

I need not point out to this committee the great contributions, which have been made in this and other Western nations by immigrants who, like these, have fled from Communist terror, is very high.

The remaining special-quota numbers are made available to qualified persons from the territories of our NATO partners, Italy, the Netherlands and Greece, as you well know.

Italy's struggle to meet her overpopulation problem is well known. The Italian surplus population is not, as popularly supposed, a permanent and insoluble problem. Already the flow of emigrants to Canada, Australia, and to Latin America is beginning to compensate for the long period during which Mussolini discouraged normal emigration, for the total cessation of emigration during the war and for the influx of approximately one-half million people from the former Italian colonies and Istria and Venezia Giulia. The present population problem largely results from these causes and from the high birth rate of the 1930's when Mussolini was bent on re-creating a populous Roman Empire. In other words, when he wanted to establish a very large reservoir of cannon fodder. The current birth rate is 17.6 per 1,000 population compared, for example, with 19.4 for France and 24.6 for the United States. With such an underlying situation, which will have its full moderating impact upon the economy in the coming years, the current Italian problem is one primarily of handling the accumulated backlog which Italy, despite valiant efforts, cannot manage by itself.

The United States Government has consistently urged other friendly nations to help out in this situation. During the 5 years between 1946 and 1951, they have taken approximately 750,000 Italians of whom about 500,000 have gone overseas, the remainder being resettled in other European countries. We hope and would expect that our direct contribution of admitting to the United States 75,000 Italians from Italy and Trieste over a 2-year period would further encourage other countries to do even more.

It is proposed to admit an additional 20,000 from the Netherlands in the next 2 years to assist that country in meeting its serious overpopulation problem. The desirable level of emigration should be about 60,000 annually. Indonesian independence not only closed a traditional outlet for Dutch migration but also resulted in the repatriation of Dutch families who had over generations been settled in the Dutch East Indies. These people returned to a country badly devastated by the war, and already seriously overcrowded. It is appropriate to recall the terrible flood disaster which this past winter swept over the Netherlands, and which dramatically pointed up the problems faced by that country and the need for help in alleviating the pressing overpopulation problem. I think we can take credit for the

way in which we have then assisted the Netherlands and they have expressed their unbounded gratitude.

During the last year about 40,000 found the opportunity to emigrate, primarily to Canada and to Australia. The openings provided in the United States for 20,000 immigrants from the Netherlands in the next 2 years would not only be regarded as an extremely friendly gesture on our part, but it would do much to strengthen the economy of one of our staunchest allies.

Greece also belongs to this group whose valiant efforts to build our western defense against communism while maintaining decent living standards could be defeated by the crushing weight of surplus populations. For example, Greece has 6 times as many new workers entering the labor market yearly as Belgium and Sweden which have populations of comparable size. Lack of resources, and of arable land, combined with war devastation and Communist guerrilla warfare, have gravely heightened the population problem. Increasing emigration to Canada and Australia is assisting. The admission into the United States of an additional 20,000 Greeks would considerably ease the burden on the local economy and strengthen the bonds between this country and Greece which stands so courageously on the easternmost flank of our defenses.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I say that the problems dealt with in the President's letter and in the committee print are of most serious concern. The countries suffering from population pressures and having a large influx of escapees from totalitarianism have made valiant efforts to absorb as many people as they can into their own economies. The United States and other free countries have in turn taken steps to assist in alleviating the problem. The program being considered by you would be our most effective contribution. Furthermore, it would lend encouragement to the other countries to redouble their efforts and to raise their goals. We have already had indications that they will follow. We would thus be strengthening the internal health and defenses of our NATO allies and our friends in Europe, as we continue in our common efforts to create effective defenses against threats of external military aggression. And, we could be offering hope of a life in freedom to many who have had the courage to flee from the Communist terror in their own lands in search of liberty.

Consequently, the Department of State urges the passage of this legislative measure.

Mr. GRAHAM. General Smith, as a further continuation of your testimony, there are three questions which the Chair would like to ask you, one of which you already dwelled upon. But we would, if you would care to amplify it, be glad to hear you. The first question is:

What are other countries doing about this migration problem? You testified to that lightly on the second page in paragraphs two and three.

General SMITH. I have, Mr. Chairman, and I have some notes in more detail which I think may be helpful to the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. We would be glad to hear you.

General SMITH. Canada, which has a total population of 14 million, admitted approximately 773,550 persons from the end of the war in 1945 to August 31, 1952. The total admitted in 1951 was 194,000 persons. In the first 8 months of 1952, Canada received 126,029 migrants from Europe.

Mr. CELLER. May I ask you at that point—

Mr. GRAHAM. Let the General finish and then ask anything you want.

General SMITH. Very well, Mr. Chairman. Australia—

Mr. CELLER. I wanted to ask about Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not want to interrupt the General until he is finished. Let him testify. Then we will hear you.

General SMITH. This is rather brief and I will go on to the detail, if I may, Mr. Celler.

Australia has received since the end of the war 720,000 permanent new settlers from Europe which brought her total population in mid-1952 to 8,650,000. Australia admitted 175,000 emigrants in 1950 and 130,000 in each of the years 1951 and 1952. In the period of 1949 and 1950, the Australian population increased by 3.24 percent a year. Of this increase, 1.8 percent was due to immigration and 1.365 to natural increases.

We have dependable statistics of the receipt of European emigrants in Latin America in very few cases. Mostly they are rather difficult to secure.

The movement of European migrants to Latin American countries over a number of years closely approximates the number of permanent immigrants from Europe received in the United States.

At the fifth session of the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration in April 1953, the Argentine representative reported that Argentina had received 600,000 migrants from Europe during the last 5 years. Within Europe itself, substantial movement of manpower takes place across frontiers. France has admitted approximately 200,000 Italians in the postwar period for residence, including 28,000 in 1952, aside from a very large number of seasonal workers who, as you know, come in during their wine season or the fig season in southern France and then return.

The gross movement of Italians into Belgium largely for work in mines reached a total of 30,000 in 1951 alone. About 40,000 Italians received work permits to enter Switzerland in 1950. The figure rose to 80,000 in 1951. Some of these were seasonal workers and it can be assumed that a good many of them returned to Italy. While the movement of labor among European countries is thus sizable, both the Committee and the Council of Europe are exploring ways in which it can be enlarged.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Smith, pardon me. You may already know Mr. Willis of Louisiana, Mr. Wilson of Texas, Mr. Walter, Mr. Celler, Mr. Reed the chairman of the committee, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Mr. Hillings of California and Mr. Crumpacker of Indiana.

Now, Mr. Celler, go ahead.

Mr. CELLER. I was curious to know whether the number of immigrants received by Canada is increasing or is it tapering off in number? I did not get your figures, the comparison from 1952.

General SMITH. Last year it tapered off a little bit. We expect it to increase.

Mr. CELLER. I think you said you expect it to increase?

General SMITH. Yes, sir. Of course we expect, Mr. Celler, that if your committee print is accepted, if this Congress acts favorably on this proposal, that this will constitute a move in leadership which will be followed. In fact, I am certain of that.

Mr. CELLER. Have you any information as to the receptivity of immigrants by the Union of South Africa?

General SMITH. I am sure that my assistants here who are experts, and whoever can answer that question, do so. How about the reception of immigrants in South Africa?

Mr. WARREN. We have no figures, Mr. Chairman, but the movement to South Africa is very small, not significant in the problem.

Mr. CELLER. What about Spain?

General SMITH. Another overpopulated country, Mr. Celler where there is solemn poverty; very little there.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I ask two other questions, and I would like to ask them in continuity, and then other members may ask their questions. My second question is: Why have the population pressure problems of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands been included in this program?

General SMITH. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I touched on in the statement, the population pressures in Greece, Italy and the Netherlands are a serious drag on their economies with repercussions on the political stability in Italy and Greece.

Now these countries, as you all know, are NATO partners and they are occupying key positions in our common defense effort. A good many of you, if I may digress a minute, have traveled through southern and central Italy. Some of you have read an extremely fascinating book called "Christ Stopped At Eboli" written by one of the leaders of the Italian——

Mr. CELLER. Carlos Levi.

General SMITH. You know, then, the pressure of population and of what amounts to solemn poverty in that agricultural area where ordinarily it would not be expected that the Communist philosophy would make great inroads. That is, small land owners, but the trouble is that the conditions are such that there is where the grave danger lies, even in comparison with the industrial areas in northern Italy.

The NATO countries have recognized the importance of the problem. The organization itself has called for further efforts in assisting it. Other organizations in which we participate such as the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration have made similar appeals to their members. The level of emigration from the overpopulated countries has been appreciably raised by major contributions from countries like Canada, Australia and some in Latin America. The total level reached, however, is not yet sufficient to make effective inroads into the accumulated surplus population backlog. By reducing the number of people which the economies in these countries cannot absorb, we are reducing the amount of economic assistance which these countries require from the outside. By offering a program of special immigration into the United States, we not only make a direct contribution in helping our NATO partners, but we hope and expect that in this manner as I have said before, that we will provide the leadership to other countries in encouraging them to enlarge their immigration programs and to accept larger numbers from Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands as well as from the escapee group. In fact, I can say with almost certainty it will.

From such a combined effort, it is hoped that the problem can be reduced to manageable proportions within the countries themselves and that, of course, is what we seek.

Mr. GRAHAM. Before leaving that topic, do any of the members desire to ask General Smith anything?

Mr. CELLER. General, do you know how many escapees have crossed through the Brandenburg Gate at East Berlin to West Berlin?

General SMITH. I do not offhand, sir. I have figures on that from time to time. I will be glad to get them for you by periods if you like. I do know, however—

Mr. CELLER. There are a great many. I was there and I saw myself on a particular Monday morning as many as 1,200 had come in up to 9 o'clock and they were still streaming in after that hour.

General SMITH. That is right, Mr. Celler. I am glad you mentioned that because you get there in a small area a picture of what is going on to a greater or less degree all along this frontier where the free world is in contact with the authoritarian world of communism.

In some places, of course, the frontiers are almost impossible to cross. In other places, it is possible to cross. In some places a man or a woman risks his life. The odds are way against him. In others, in Germany, for example, as you pointed out, there is a steady flow.

Mr. CELLER. That is the only opening now.

General SMITH. Almost the only opening. Of course, it is hard to get through the occupied areas, but you would be surprised, Mr. Celler, that there is a steady and constantly moving infiltration from East Germany actually through the occupied zone, bypassing Berlin itself, and into the free area of West Germany. Of course, that free area is like a sponge that is soaked, has soaked up all the water it can hold, and it is now dripping out. Mr. Adenauer has been extremely courageous in handling the economic problem. As you know, we recently had to provide an airlift from Berlin to take some of those escapees that you have mentioned from the Berlin area itself.

Mr. CELLER. We, or the West German government, paid for it?

General SMITH. They paid for it; we gave some assistance, as you know.

But we actually had to furnish some aircraft, and they put up the money. But we had to lift those people out, Berlin was becoming so densely populated with escapees.

Now, then, the free area of Germany, West Germany, is or has just about reached its absorptive capacity. You must also remember that we have concentrated in Germany itself and this will to a certain extent add to the question, to answer the question Mr. Walter asked. We have got people who have escaped during the advance of the Communist hordes from Central Europe, from Czechoslovakia, from Poland—a great many from Poland—from Hungary, even from the Balkans, people who dropped everything and fled to avoid being engulfed in communism. I asked my own people when I was being the devil's advocate, how did you arrive at the figure of 110,000 from Germany; why that from Germany as against so many from Italy? They said, Germany is the reservoir that all those who have fled from totalitarianism filter into, and as Congressman Celler pointed out, the neck of the funnel has actually been the Brandenburg Tor. They come through there and there you are.

Mr. CELLER. It would be interesting for the record if you could supply some information as to the numbers of those who have fled

into West Berlin and what the situation is, for example, today. I imagine there has been a tapering off because the regulations of the totalitarian regime there have become more rigid. I would like to have for the record similar information for Austria.

General SMITH. Well, here is a round-number figure which will be of assistance. We will be glad and I think it would be helpful to this committee if we gave you a sort of a month-by-month estimate which I think we can provide. But 119,000 entered West Berlin in 1952 and 150,000 in January, from January 1 to April 30, 1953.

Now, we estimate that there are about, they are averaging still in spite of all they do to close the borders, in spite of the fact that you take a grave risk now, they are running about 40,000 a month, have been running about 40,000 a month.

(The following information was supplied later:)

*Influx of German refugees (escapees) from the Soviet Zone and East Berlin to West Berlin*

	Arrivals in West Berlin	Total arrivals in West Germany (including West Berlin)
1949.....	70,000	350,000
1950.....	60,000	300,000
1951.....	55,000	225,000
1952.....	118,727	175,000
1953 (January 1-April 30).....	149,678	155,000
Total.....	453,405	1,205,000

*West Berlin—Influx and evacuation*

Since the zonal border was closed in June, 1952, relatively few (10,000–15,000) East German refugees have been able to reach West Germany directly across the zonal border. Most have arrived as evacuees flown out of West Berlin.

	Arrivals in West Berlin	Flown to West Germany		Arrivals in West Berlin	Flown to West Germany
1952—January.....	4,262	438	1952—December.....	15,787	7,074
February.....	4,179	1,566			
March.....	4,583	2,328	Total 1952.....	118,727	58,406
April.....	4,221	2,034			
May.....	5,109	2,175	1953—January.....	25,340	10,439
June.....	8,219	3,672	February.....	39,962	15,425
July.....	13,182	3,785	March.....	48,724	40,332
August.....	15,396	7,539	April.....	35,652	42,320
September.....	14,145	9,089			
October.....	15,595	10,705	Total (January-April 1953).....	149,678	108,516
November.....	14,049	8,001			

Mr. CELLER. Is that in West Berlin alone?

General SMITH. Yes, sir; in our figures we have an estimate here of 1,800,000 German escapees from the Soviet zone of military occupation in West Germany. Well, that is an awful lot.

(The following information was supplied later:)

*West Germany—German refugees (escapees) from the Soviet Zone and East Berlin*

Sept. 13, 1950.....	1,555,075	Sept. 30, 1952.....	1,800,000
Sept. 30, 1951.....	1,711,247	Apr. 30, 1953.....	1,945,000

Mr. CELLER. Have you a breakdown as to the nationality of those escapees coming into West Berlin?

General SMITH. These are Germans we are talking about only.

Mr. CELLER. There must be additional—

General SMITH. Yes; oh, yes, there are.

Mr. CELLER. Poles, Czechs, and so forth.

General SMITH. Yes, there are; we have it. I do not have it immediately available but we will be very happy to place that information on record with the committee because it will be a matter of considerable interest to you.

(The following information was supplied later:)

#### GERMAN EXPELLEES

*West Germany—German expellees, primarily from Eastern Europe and former German territory east of the Oder-Neisse*

Dwelling place as of Sept. 1, 1939:

East of Oder-Neisse (Polish administration).....	4, 422, 858
Czechoslovakia.....	1, 912, 000
Poland.....	409, 654
Danzig.....	224, 812
Hungary.....	177, 817
Rumania.....	148, 596
Yugoslavia.....	147, 494
Baltic States.....	59, 440
U. S. S. R.....	51, 235
Memelland.....	47, 740
Saar.....	46, 602
Other European countries.....	206, 628
Overseas.....	21, 335
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7, 876, 211</b>

*Austria—German expellees or volksdeutsche (as of Mar. 1, 1953)*

Dwelling place as of Sept. 1, 1939	Granted Austrian citizenship since 1945	Remaining as of Mar. 1, 1953
Balt.....		179
Bulgarian.....	28	266
Czech.....	92, 915	46, 397
German.....	60, 482	24, 099
Hungarian.....	5, 585	8, 479
Yugoslav.....	27, 732	93, 404
Rumanian.....	7, 193	37, 354
Russian.....	295	1, 071
Polish.....	4, 165	4, 370
Other.....	3, 648	1, 340
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>202, 043</b>	<b>216, 959</b>

#### NON-GERMAN REFUGEES (ESCAPEES)

*Germany.*—A complete breakdown by nationality of all the non-German refugees (escapees) in Germany, estimated to be in excess of 100,000, is not available. The following breakdown is given, as illustrative, of those registered with the United States escapee program as having arrived in West Germany after January 1, 1948:

Albanians.....	7	Rumanians.....	116
Balts.....	260	USSR.....	381
Bulgarians.....	97	Yugoslavs.....	457
Czechs.....	2, 838		
Hungarians.....	695	<b>Total.....</b>	<b>5, 814</b>
Poles.....	963		



*Austria.*—Non-German refugees present in Austria, by former nationality:

Greek.....	731	Bulgarians.....	818
Czech.....	2, 504	Hungarians.....	7, 948
Yugoslav.....	12, 376	Rumanians.....	1, 418
Polish.....	3, 216	Stateless.....	4, 887
Soviet.....	1, 565	Jewish.....	1, 108
White Russians.....	392	Other.....	2, 230
Ukrainians.....	2, 545		
Balts.....	604	Total.....	42, 342

Mr. CELLER. It is interesting to have you emphasize the fact that the Italian birthrate is not as high as people think it is; and it is lower than ours. It is well to add emphasis to that fact because we often are confronted with the argument that the birthrate is too high. Why is it not lowered? Now we have the information that their birthrate is practically lower than our birthrate. What would the effect of the passage of this bill have, in your estimation, upon the June elections in Italy?

General SMITH. I think, Mr. Celler, that it would be one of the most helpful things that could possibly be done. As a matter of fact, simply the announcement that the proposal has been made to the Congress and is being considered by the Congress of the United States, and I sometimes wonder whether you gentlemen realize the weight that is attached abroad to the simple fact that you are considering a measure. We are informed that the President's letter has had a remarkable effect already in those areas where we devoutly hope the coalition of free parties will attain a majority of 50 or 51 percent. It has had a most beneficial effect. I believe the passage of this legislation would have an effect all out of proportion to the actual economic or physical effect, moral or political effect.

Mr. CELLER. Am I correct in this conclusion, also, General, that with reference to those elections to be held in June, the coalition of the democratic forces is not assured of a victory and that the combination of the Monarchists and the Facists and the Communists develop a touch-and-go situation and that passage of the bill of this character might turn the scales to victory for the democratic De Gasperi forces; am I correct in that?

General SMITH. You are eminently correct, Mr. Celler. As I said, we are hoping for a 51 percent by the coalition of democratic parties.

Mr. CELLER. Fifty-one percent would mean practically 65 percent in the Chamber of Deputies?

General SMITH. It would mean practically that. We are hoping for that but the odds that they will get 51 percent are extremely scanty.

Now, if Premier de Gasperi ever has a sufficiently strong majority in the Chamber of Deputies to do some of the things that he urgently wants to do of which you ladies and gentlemen are well aware, in the way of continuing his program of land reform and other things of that sort, which have been already so helpful, a lot of our own problems will be reduced. They want to stand on their own feet; those people are anxious to do it. It has been touch and go with him politically every time there has been an election. It is touch and go this time. If he should get that and I think this bill would materially assist it, I am awfully glad you raised the point.

Mr. CELLER. What is the birthrate of Holland in comparison to our own?

General SMITH. I do not know but some of these gentlemen can tell you.

Mr. CELLER. Very high, is it not?

Mr. HOROWITZ. Twenty-two and four tenths per thousand.

Mr. CELLER. A little lower than ours.

Mr. GRAHAM. Slightly lower than ours at the moment.

Mr. CELLER. Wouldn't you say that is one of the most densely populated countries of the world?

General SMITH. Yes, it is. You have driven through it, I know, on one of your trips over there. The first time I ever drove through Holland it was simply amazing. Here were these clean little towns, and they are clean, you know. You would think they scrub the sidewalks and it was about the time that school and early work was letting out. Everybody on bicycles. Well, you might as well have gotten out of your car and walked. There was just a swarm of people at every town. It is densely populated and I may say densely populated with good people.

If course, the colonial areas to which Holland used to look for surplus population and indeed for a large proportion of her income are independent. This wave of nationalism, and we believe rightly, has swept over those areas. The fact remains that it has given Holland a very grave problem.

Mr. GRAHAM. General, the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, Hon. Chauncey Reed, would like to interrogate you for a moment.

Mr. REED. I was somewhat interested in the congested situation in Western Germany. I do not mean particularly Berlin but Western Germany itself. I think when we were there a couple of years ago it was estimated that about 1,500 a day were coming across the border into Western Germany. Does that rate still prevail or is it greater?

General SMITH. I think it is greater now, has been greater, because, as you know, the pressures in the east have grown enormously. On the other hand, within the past 6 to 10 months, or within the past year, the Soviet occupation zone has really established a no man's land in the frontier which is becoming more and more difficult to cross. It is surprising the risks that those people will take to get to freedom. So, the figures are about, what was it per day?

Mr. GRAY. About 40,000 a month.

General SMITH. So you see, there is an awful lot, Mr. Reed; about 45,000.

Mr. REED. About the same as it was.

I presume a large percentage of those people come from East Germany, do they not?

General SMITH. Yes, they do; they do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well now, the members of the subcommittee first. Mr. Hillings, any question?

Mr. HILLINGS. Yes, sir; I have a few questions, Mr. Chairman.

General, back to your discussion of the Italian problem, I find it a little difficult to follow your reasoning that favorable action on this legislation could have a resultant favorable effect on the Italian elections. I wonder if you could amplify your reasons for that?

General SMITH. Yes, Mr. Hillings.

Mr. HILLINGS. Let me interrupt just to say that it seems to me rather odd for a political party to be able to campaign in Italy on

the basis that if they win they are going to be able to ship a lot of people out of the country to America.

General SMITH. It does, on first blush, Mr. Hillings, but the fact is that the major economic problem is overpopulation. Of course, that was what Mussolini was shooting for in his conquests in north Africa and places of that sort, an area to which the surplus population of Italy, that overpopulation making Italy the solemnly poor country that it is, could go. There is now, except for the figures that I have given you, no other outlet for surplus Italian population.

If you drive through south central Italy, you will see these little villages which are literally crowded and the arable land available to each family is measured almost by the square yard. Many of the members of the committee have done that. I know Mr. Celler knows that situation. I believe you were up there, Mr. Celler, at one time and you saw the thing. So that is their basic economic and political problem. It is a problem which Italy has been trying to solve for a century. Any offer of a palliative or even a partial solution of this grave economic problem to a government in power, or a government which is attempting to stay in power, is of assistance to it. Just as though you were to offer to an administration in power some proposal from abroad which would materially enhance the standard of living of the American people. It is a direct analogy.

Mr. HILLINGS. Now, is it not true, though, that the Italian Government has a bureau of emigration as distinct from immigration and that it is the desire of the Italian Government not to let the scientists, the doctors, the teachers, the professional people, the educated people, leave the country but rather the individuals that that bureau of emigration wants to funnel out to America and elsewhere would be the unskilled laborers who would find great difficulty in maintaining a livelihood in America or some other country should they come here?

General SMITH. It is largely the surplus population, yes, largely labor, the agricultural and working groups. The Italian Government as far as I know does not place any obstacle in the way, particularly of anyone who wants to leave Italy, be he a scientists or intellectual, but the pressure of population, and believe you me you measure it the way you measure excess pressure in an automobile tire, is terrific in there.

Mr. HILLINGS. Actually, though, that policy of letting primarily the unskilled laborers leave the country could have the result of some serious economic effects on this country in absorbing them. They would, in many cases, have to be trained here for a job and there might not be positions available for large number of unskilled laborers whereas there is for skilled.

General SMITH. It would, Mr. Hillings, unless we applied as we intend to do the usual safeguards of our immigration legislation and as proposed in the committee print, we would use for this special intake some of the procedures of the DP Act which lay an emphasis on the immigrant having an assured employment and housing when he comes to this country.

Mr. HILLINGS. That would be done in the instance of all these people.

General SMITH. That is right.

Mr. HILLINGS. How are you going to be sure? Do you have safeguards in mind with regard to this. How will we be sure that in the case of Italy where some 40 percent or more of the people voted for the Communists in the recent elections, that we are not going to get a lot of Communists that the Italian Government wants to ship out of the country?

General SMITH. As I stated in the presentation, Mr. Hillings, we actually propose to provide greater screening facilities and more safeguards than are provided in the present immigration acts. We recognize that possibility. And we have got to cater for it. It means a big job of work by all the departments concerned.

Mr. HILLINGS. And I notice you discussed in your testimony and also in response to a question from the chairman the problem of trying to encourage other countries to help in this problem. Are you satisfied that the other countries, particularly Australia and Canada, some of those countries, are doing as much as they can to carry their share of the load on this resettlement program, or do you think that it is possible that they could be doing a little more?

General SMITH. We think it is possible that they could be doing a little more and that, what I meant when I said that we by taking the leadership would encourage them to do more—as a matter of fact, we have had informal indication from most of them that they are prepared to follow us and do more. They recognize the difficulty as much as we.

Mr. GRAHAM. General Smith, before calling on Miss Thompson who is a member of the subcommittee, I had a third question I would like to ask you. My third question is: Will not the places created by emigration simply be filled up again by higher birthrates with no actual benefits resulting in the European countries themselves?

General SMITH. That is a \$64 one. I am glad that these bright young men who are sitting here with me have provided me with an answer to some of the anticipated questions so I can give it with more apparent intelligence than I actually possess on this very complicated subject.

The fact is that the rate of natural increase is only one of the factors involved. We are dealing here primarily with accumulations, backlogs resulting from the disruptions of normal population movements during World War II. I do not need to enlarge on that because the gentlemen whom I see sitting here I have seen abroad at various times when you were really seeing evidence of it and you know what that means. And of course, it has been enormously complicated by the establishment of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. There are a lot of people who live there that do not like those gentlemen, and of course, they are getting out, doing what they can. Once the backlog is cut significantly, there will be a better chance for the natural increase to be absorbed by the domestic situation or to find outlets through normal emigration. But it is a special problem that we are confronting now.

The experience of the countries in Western Europe suggests that the places of immigrants are not taken up by higher birth rates. The stability of Northern Europe, Scandinavia, and the U. K., may have resulted in good part from their having had emigration outlets. Substantial emigration outlets eased Ireland, Norway, Scotland, probably the U. K., through periods of acute political and social diffi-

culties. And Italy, as we have already discussed at some length, is a good example of the current problem.

The Italian problem does not result from a presently high birth-rate and I was rather surprised. More than a little surprised, as a matter of fact, to see the comparison between the Italian birthrate and our own. That is why I am so glad that Mr. Cellar emphasized the question. In fact, the birth rate in the United States, France, and the Netherlands, has been higher than that of 17.6 per thousand which Italy now has.

What is more pertinent is that the combination of high birthrates in earlier periods, the bottling up of normal emigration for 30 years under Mussolini, during the war and postwar repatriation of half a million Italians from Italy's former colonies and territories, transferred to Yugoslavia, these factors resulted in unusual temporary pressure on your labor market. As a matter of fact, these changes in shifts of population were quite remarkable. I went down to our frontier at the end of the war when the Germans from the Sudetenland were being moved back and forth. Those shifts in population, they are amazing and they are tragic things to witness, really. In Italy, there are twice as many entrants to the labor force ages as departures through death and retirement. The underlying current birth rate trend makes this a temporary problem.

The essential problem posed by population trends in Italy at the present time is to find suitable employment for these new workers either at an expanding economy or in other countries. And at the same time to reduce the large accumulated backlog to manageable proportions. If we ever get these people sorted out from these sort of pools that they have drifted into, Italy for example, they are rushed back from Eritrea, Trieste, the colonial areas, the same thing in Germany, then I think the problem is, as I have said, manageable. Thank you for asking that question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. General Smith, both Miss Thompson of Michigan and Mr. Walter of Pennsylvania, are here and they have simultaneously introduced bills to permit 25,000 refugees of the Netherlands to come in. I would like to have Miss Thompson interrogate you.

Miss THOMPSON. I would like to ask the general one preliminary question. In your statement you have said that Canada allowed 775,000 immigrants in the past year. I wonder if you have any idea how many of those emigrants have trickled across the border into the United States, how many thousands and thousands of them, to the city of Detroit alone. And that is true across the entire border between the two countries.

General SMITH. I do not know, Miss Thompson. Some of the other representatives of other agencies who are responsible for keeping an eye on things of that sort for preventing illegal entry, and so forth, ought to be able to answer that question, but if you like, I will get an estimate and file it with the committee records.

Miss THOMPSON. We in Michigan are very much aware of that situation and Canada really cannot take credit for taking care of the 775,000 emigrants, in my opinion.

General SMITH. Not if they just use it as a staging area, I should say that is quite true.

Miss THOMPSON. Then I would like to know, General, in regard to the situation in the Netherlands, the problem of overpopulation and

the problem of refugees and disaster victims should not be considered in one category, in your opinion, do you think?

General SMITH. No; you are quite right. But I mentioned the disaster situation which has—

Miss THOMPSON. The matter of overpopulation does not become an emergency measure:

General SMITH. No, except there is this: I agree with you that they are two different problems. On the other hand, take the Island of Walcheren. We wanted to capture the island of Walcheren during the war and we wanted to do it the right way, without losing a great many of our young men, or more than we wanted to lose and the way we did it was to bomb the dykes and flood the island, flood most of it. We did bomb the dykes and flooded Walcheren. Of course, as you know, although they have methods now for rehabilitating land which has been flooded by salt water much more quickly than it used to be—formerly, a salt-flooded area I understand was out of production for a number of years. Now they can bring it back rather quickly. The fact remains that we flooded Walcheren and we made it impossible for the people on Walcheren to make a living from the land for a considerable time. Then along came the last disaster and flooded Walcheren again. So, while the problems are different, there is, Miss Thompson, a direct relationship. Pressures of population as compared with the ability of the land to support that population. That is why I mentioned two of them.

Miss THOMPSON. H. R. 4044 which I introduced would admit 25,000 refugees as a result of the flood disaster.

General SMITH. Yes.

Miss THOMPSON. I would like to state that one of the clergymen in my State has taken the responsibility of finding sponsors for these victims. And he has found a sponsor for every one of the 25,000 victims.

General SMITH. Really!

Miss THOMPSON. But he is having difficulty now in getting 25,000 disaster victims in the mood to come to this country.

General SMITH. Well, I know that our quotas from Holland are heavily oversubscribed. That is, you wait, I think, about 3 years before you get to the top of the list in Holland and I should say if there is a really good reason for that, it is probably because the disaster areas hit, the floods hit the rural areas in Holland. Well, of course, the people want to stay and rehabilitate their land. The pressures of population are largely felt in the cities. That may be an explanation. I will ask these gentlemen here.

Mr. GRAY. That is the thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. They say that is just it.

General SMITH. Whether that is out of deference to the lack of knowledge of the senior officer here or whether it is a fact or not, but that would be my guess, the people attached to the soil where the disaster has hit can rehabilitate and get along.

Mr. GRAHAM. The only member of the subcommittee who has not interrogated you, General, is Mr. Walter. He started to ask you a question and you answered it in part during the discussion. Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, General, those of us who participated in the drafting of the DP legislation and who were responsible for this

intergovernmental agency set up at Brussels—I happened to have been a delegate with our distinguished friend, George Warren who sits at your left—are well aware of this problem. I am wondering what effect this gesture, and gesture is all it is, would have on the participation and the continued interest of the 20-odd nations who are now members of that organization?

General SMITH. I am going to defer to Mr. Warren for an answer to that.

Mr. WALTER. I know what his answer is going to be. I have talked with him about this at length.

General SMITH. As a matter of fact, I do not know. I hope for the best.

Mr. WALTER. You said very definitely that enactment of this legislation would provide leadership and as a result of that, other nations would be encouraged to increase their activities. Now, I do not know what encouragement they need when they are already members of an organization set up for the very purpose of moving migrants from Europe.

General SMITH. The only way I can answer that, Mr. Walter, is to say this: these programs, fine as they are in their inception, have a tendency to sort of bog down when nations are preoccupied with their own internal problems just as the EDC program, which everybody agreed was the hope of salvation for Western defense, everybody had given it complete moral support, all the European nations belonging to NATO had expressed their approbation of it. Then it went along and struck a doldrum and it required a sort of dramatic movement to give it life.

Mr. WALTER. It seems to me that our leadership in the field ought to be to prevent that sort of thing from happening.

General SMITH. So it should, sir.

Mr. WALTER. We might well use our ingenuity, if that is the word, in encouraging more nations to participate. I understand that since the meeting at Brussels, Mr. Hugh Gibson the very distinguished head of this organization, and than whom there is not a better man for that sort of a job in this whole country or in the field, succeeded in prevailing even upon Argentina to participate. Now, with the vast territory there, and the vast undeveloped territory away from the coast in Brazil and Venezuela, it certainly seems to me that instead of there being a mere gesture, we could effectively solve this problem.

Now, bearing in mind the type of people that you said constitute the surplus populations, they are the kind of people to do homesteading work, pioneering. They are the kind of people who were the pioneers in this Nation.

General SMITH. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. And with the vast natural resources undeveloped, I should think that that would be the place to direct our attention.

I might inform you, if you do not already know, that Brazil recently entered into an agreement with Japan to take what was it, George, 25,000 Japanese? I do not know how much leadership is needed to encourage Australia to take people because on the 4 or 5 official visits that I made to Europe in connection with this problem, Australians always said without any hesitancy that they would take as many people as they could get. They were frightened in the last war and they still have that same fear. They want to develop their

country, a great undeveloped territory in which they have every natural resource with the possible exception of oil. Now, it is just as simple as providing ships, moving people; they will take these people.

I am disturbed by the thing that disturbs our distinguished colleague, Miss Thompson. Did not Canada break off their unilateral agreement with Italy with respect to moving people because they found that the only people they were getting were undesirables, not unskilled laborers but undesirables?

General SMITH. What you say is very well put. My answer is, yes, I think we should do both. I am not addressing myself to the last sentence. I will mention that later.

I talked with the Prime Minister of New Zealand the other day.

Mr. WALTER. So did I; he called on me.

General SMITH. A very interesting program of assisting immigration. You are quite right in saying that it needs not only a gesture, and that is what this is.

Mr. WALTER. It certainly seems to me that if conditions in Italy are so precarious that a gesture on the part of the United States would be the difference between communism and anticommunism, we could not forever continue to make these gestures. Ultimately we would have to consider such cause as hopeless.

General SMITH. I think you are oversimplifying a little, Mr. Walter, on that. We are doing a great deal more. I do not want to go into detail at this time on what we are doing to save the cause of anticommunism in Italy.

Mr. WALTER. I know; Mr. Reed and I spent an entire day with Mr. de Gasperi and we talked at great length about this thing. But don't you think, in view of all these things that we know about, that we ought to direct our consideration to the refugee problem and to that alone?

General SMITH. You mean in Italy?

Mr. WALTER. No, no; the refugee problem. There are no refugees in Italy except down in Trieste and—

General SMITH. No, I do not, Mr. Walter. I think that both the refugee and the overpopulation problem, the second being as I believe, and as I have expressed to you, a temporary situation resulting from an unusual combination of circumstances over the years, are inseparable. I may be wrong on that but I do not believe so. I think that we have to drain off the surplus, be it refugee or just straight overpopulation, and get it down to manageable proportions and then we can act.

Mr. WALTER. Drain off surplus with these figures? That would not be a drop in the bucket.

General SMITH. I was about to say—

Mr. GRAHAM. Have to get another bucket.

General SMITH. I was about to say that I certainly subscribe to your statement that this gesture, as we call it, and which it is considered in terms of the total problem, must certainly be combined with the most aggressive and effective leadership over a period of time to solve the whole problem of overpopulation.

Mr. WALTER. But we have provided the leadership in the Displaced Persons Act. We made it possible for the United States to legally participate in an international organization designed to move



people. In the ECA Act and the Mutual Security Act, we provided the funds, \$10 million as I remember, and before we left Brussels, Mr. Warren and I, we passed the hat and had \$30 million. That is evidence of the interest that was displayed by other nations as a result of the leadership that you talk about.

Now then, do you not feel that in view of the fact that we have provided leadership—and you indicate that that is all we can do—now that we have done that, do you not think that we should consider the temporary problem, namely, the problem created by the escapee? The other problem is not a temporary one; it is a long-range problem that is going to take time to settle.

General SMITH. What you are calling leadership I would call pointing the way, Mr. Walter. We have done that, but leadership to me means the continuous and aggressive action by men who are leaders and that must be provided and must continue. We ask this as an additional measure of assistance to those men whom we hope will now provide the aggressive and the continuous leadership, the Congress having pointed the way by enacting the initial bill.

Mr. WALTER. But you recognize the need for our participation in this organization set up at Brussels?

General SMITH. Well, I am afraid I do not quite understand the specific question.

Mr. WALTER. The specific question is, what more leadership in the field of finding a permanent solution can we provide? Taking 75,000 people from Italy over a period of 2 years, you think that would provide a solution where the problem is one running into millions of people?

General SMITH. No, Mr. Walter, but I think that it will give us a start on revivifying this organization and getting it to the point where the people who are associated with us will make additional and further effective contributions.

Mr. WALTER. I recently talked with the Italian representative in this organization and he makes the most glowing report of what they are doing. After all, these other nations——

General SMITH. I think any representative of an organization which is doing a pretty good job would make a good report and I think they have done a good job.

Mr. WALTER. Maybe then this would be construed as a reflection on what they are doing.

General SMITH. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WALTER. What has happened——

General SMITH. I think it would be a shot in the arm.

Mr. WALTER. What has happened to the three-hundred-and-forty-thousand-odd displaced persons that we brought here under the Displaced Persons Act?

General SMITH. May I restate the question? What has happened to the three-hundred-and-forty-thousand-odd displaced persons that we brought here in accordance with the act?

Mr. WALTER. Where are they?

General SMITH. That is a large question, sir; possibly some of these gentlemen can answer.

Mr. WALTER. It is a large question but it is an important one because it has a direct bearing on the effect of large-scale emigration on employment, housing, and our own economy. And I would like

to know where those people got to because under our Constitution, unlike the Canadian laws, we cannot require a person to remain on the job to which he is brought. So that within minutes after he arrives, he may go off to a community of his own people. We saw in Detroit—if you please, Miss Thompson, now we are talking about Michigan—unemployment created by those people and it was not until the Displaced Persons Commission stepped in and moved a lot of these people elsewhere, where there was employment, that the unemployment situation they created was relieved.

General SMITH. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Immigration Service might be able to give a much more intelligent answer to that question than I. The most intelligent answer that I can give is that I do not know and I would have to seek the information.

Mr. WALTER. Well, only yesterday I talked with ex-Governor Tuck of Virginia concerning this problem because it concerns some experiences some of my friends in Virginia had with people who were alleged to be farmers before they got here and he says he would venture to guess that there was not a displaced person remaining in Virginia. When the program got under way, we saw what was happening, that is, those of us who were interested in the displaced persons program. In one instance arrangements were made to bring a shipload or two shiploads of people to New Orleans. Assurances of jobs were found in the South but within days the new arrivals were on their way to Milwaukee, every last one of them.

Mr. CELLER. Would you yield on that point? The bill that I offered and I think the committee print has this provision—in my bill it is page 8, line 7, if you want to follow me:

*Provided, That in determining whether or not the person accepted and agreed in good faith to abide by the said terms of employment the Attorney General shall consider the manner, conditions, extent, and duration of the person's employment after admission into the United States.*

Well, that would act as a moral check if not otherwise on the remaining employment by either the displaced persons or the person entering under the terms of the proposed bill, or my bill, or any other similar bill.

Mr. WALTER. There is identical language in the proposed bill.

As a matter of fact, General, this committee print is practically the same as the bill 7376.

General SMITH. That is right, sir.

Mr. WALTER. That the last Congress had before it.

General SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Much the same as H. R. 2076 of the 83d Congress.

General SMITH. That is right, Mr. Walter. You have worked on those things. You are thoroughly familiar with them. I think that—

Mr. WALTER. I am fairly familiar; yes, sir.

General SMITH. I think that the committee print, that provision cited by Representative Celler in the committee print, is about as good a moral safeguard as you can provide under our laws; for what you pointed out, that is, the possibility of just a concentration into urban centers of people who undertake to accept rural work, things of that sort. But I believe—

Mr. WALTER. How many escapees will find their way into the coal-mining regions of the State of Pennsylvania in which coal miners are

working less than 150 days in a year and with this disgustingly mild winter we have had, in all probability will not work at all.

General SMITH. You know, we have written in there as well as we could all sorts of provisions and safeguards to be applied in connection with our own internal labor problems.

Mr. WALTER. They are absolutely meaningless and unenforceable; I will say that without any equivocation.

General SMITH. And maybe we will have a bad winter coming up, too.

Mr. WALTER. No such luck.

General SMITH. I recognize exactly the force of what you say.

Mr. WALTER. General, what about the attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward this problem?

General SMITH. Does anybody know the attitude of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. CELLER. Maybe I could help on that. The bill we had last year for the admission of 300,000, my bill, elicited from the American Federation of Labor a statement by Walter J. Mason, a member of the national legislative committee of the federation—I am reading from page 179 of the hearings on H. R. 7376 in the last Congress, the following:

The American Federation of Labor supports the purposes of H. R. 7376 under which immigration of an additional 300,000 persons from Europe over a 3-year period would be authorized.

And then he also says:

That the people who would be admitted to the United States under the Celler bill are friends of freedom, not for communism; that is why they fled from Eastern Europe. Naturally, the American Federation of Labor would be deeply concerned if the proposed legislation were to jeopardize the well-being of our people, but we see no such possibility under the terms of the Celler bill.

Then I will say also a communication was received from Mr. Philip Murray, head of the CIO, on this subject to the same effect that it favored the enactment of a bill admitting 300,000 persons into the country.

General SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to Mr. Celler but I would suggest that Mr. Durkin, the Secretary of Labor, is on your list of witnesses; would you ask him about that?

Mr. WALTER. On page 10 of this print, section 11, does not that section prevent the distribution of these people in accordance with our ability to absorb them? In other words, would not that section create the very situation that we are fearful of, communities in which there is always unemployment?

Mr. GRAY. There will be that problem but some of these people, the relatives who are settled here, will be in somewhat of a good position to provide homes for these people.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that and they become assimilated—I have quit hoping that that would happen—but they do avoid the difficulties that usually attend the immigration of such people because they are told what to do and what they cannot do and so on. But would not this very provision create unemployment in areas where employment is always a fluctuating thing?

Mr. GRAY. That has been such a problem as you know. This is Mr. Maney of the Visa Office.

Mr. MANEY. I know the bill of which you are joint author has provision where if the Secretary of Labor finds that there is sufficient labor of any type in an area, no one having that occupation can come, get a visa to come there.

Mr. WALTER. Joint author? What are you talking about?

Mr. MANEY. The immigration bill of last year, the Walter-McCarran Act.

Mr. WALTER. You mean the Walter Act, which was H. R. 5678? Is that what you mean?

General SMITH. That I call a tactical error, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. I am quite certain that the provisions of that law will in no wise affect this. We looked at this very carefully yesterday and I am afraid that that situation would be just as I feared.

Mr. MANEY. If they have sufficient barbers in Los Angeles and a barber comes along and wants a visa under this bill to come and approaches a consul, he would not be able to issue him a visa because the Secretary of Labor has certified there are sufficient barbers in that area. If he wanted to go to Los Angeles.

Mr. WALTER. He would be ineligible under the very terms of this bill because his services are not needed in the United States, there being a surplus of that kind of people. If you will read line 16—

Mr. MANEY. He might have promise of employment from a barber-shop in Los Angeles. On paper he would have a job but we could not issue him a visa if the Secretary of Labor certified there were sufficient barbers in that area; no one could come into an area if there is sufficient labor of his type available.

Mr. WALTER. But you see in the second provision, people whose services are needed and certified as such, and persons who are blood relatives of citizens of lawfully admitted aliens—

Mr. MANEY. That is true, but the overall exclusions of the general law apply to all these people, except sections 201, 202, and 203.

Mr. WALTER. I am sorry I cannot agree with you. As a matter of law, I think you are wrong because here is the last pronouncement and where the two provisions are inconsistent then under the rule of construction of statutes, the later provision is applicable.

Mr. MANEY. I bow to your opinion on that but could that not be remedied in this section?

Mr. WALTER. Maybe. That is why I asked General Smith to tell me how to do it.

General SMITH. I have to defer to the opinion of people who are much more familiar with the details than I, and I would say this: In the first place, this section with regard to blood relatives, citizens, has undoubtedly in there inherently the danger that you suggest. There is no question about it. When you think of that—take some of the areas in Michigan, around Detroit which are practically 100 per cent Polish—there will be a tendency to gravitate to those areas; I do not believe that you can write into any bill absolute safeguards against a thing of that sort. We have done it, tried to do as much as we can.

Mr. WALTER. Try to realize this, General, that an alien will come to the United States on an assurance furnished by somebody in the middle of the State of Pennsylvania where they need farmworkers. Now, he is there. But nothing can prevent him from leaving there

and he immediately moves to Pittsburgh where employment is touch and go in the steel mills.

Mr. GRAY. Under the committee print, Mr. Walter, though, the alien would be required after obtaining this assurance to sign an oath of good faith that he would agree to terms of employment and as provided in the Celler bill, if the Attorney General finds that he has misrepresented in saying that, had no intention of conforming to it and in doing that he uses the standard of considering the manner, the condition, conditions, extent, and duration of the person's employment here, he could then deport him.

Mr. WALTER. That is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. GRAY. It is awfully difficult of administration.

General SMITH. I have got to admit that there is no question about it. Of course, this relation clause is a humanitarian thing.

Now, you have got to admit that, too.

Mr. WALTER. We admit that philosophy in the basic immigration code.

General SMITH. That is right. Now then, admitting and certainly recognizing the force and accuracy of everything you have said about this possibility, what you have to decide is whether the thing to do is to strike a humanitarian provision of that sort or to leave it in and take the chance. We felt, I must say, that because of that type of relationship we would write in what safeguards we could and take a chance.

Now, this committee may feel differently; but there is that consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, in the code the certification of labor surplus applies only to the nonpreference status. General, I assume that you have talked with our former allies of World War II. What is their attitude toward granting assistance as proposed in the bill? I ask that question for this reason, General. Last year when the subcommittee had under consideration Mr. Celler's bill, H. R. 7376 which is practically the same as this print, representatives of governments who were on our team complained very bitterly to me in private about what we were proposing to do for the people who on yesterday were shooting them. They just did not like it and they did not want to appear publicly. I am wondering whether you have given that some consideration.

General SMITH. Yes; I have, Mr. Walter, and there is not any question that there is that feeling. You cannot overlook the fact that that militates against many of the things we are trying to do. I will give you a very interesting example. At the same time that the question of German ratification, German participation in the European Defense Community was being debated in the French Chamber of Deputies, there was also taking place in France and receiving big headlines the last great collaborator and atrocity trial at which some French but more Germans were being tried for their lives for a frightful atrocity that took place in southern France. Now, those conditions exist and those feelings exist and it would be stupid of me to try to lead you to believe that they do not because you know as well as I do that they exist.

On the other hand, the British and the French particularly with regard to Italy do recognize the seriousness of the overpopulation

situation in Italy and its political repercussions. It is easier for the French because they have for years depended on Italian seasonal labor and they became accustomed to depending on this migratory labor that came into the French vineyards, picked the wine and let it go.

Mr. WALTER. In the Jura and the Rhone Valley.

General SMITH. Now, in a declaration issued in London in 1950, the British and French Foreign Ministers joined the Secretary of State in observing that overpopulation in Western European countries is, and I quote the declaration, "one of the most important elements in the difficulties and disequilibrium of the world." More recently, both the French and British Governments have participated in the efforts of NATO and other international organizations to contribute to the alleviation of the problem. The French have absorbed more than 200,000 Italians during the postwar period aside from this movement of seasonal workers. As a matter of fact, they absorbed more than that because some of these seasonal workers come in and get married or fall in love and drift on back and the French let them stay and take it this way.

Mr. WALTER. Then they had that big series of forest fires.

General, I am going to ask you the rest of these questions some other time. I want to apologize. Our distinguished chairman just informed me of your commitment and I must apologize for asking so many questions.

Mr. CELLER. We will have another turn to interrogate Mr. Smith later?

Mr. GRAHAM. Without disclosing any State Department secrets, I know that the General has been up all night and he is needed at a very important conference and he must go.

Is there anything that you would really need that he could not submit in writing, that you would care to interrogate him further about?

Mr. CELLER. What do you wish, Mr. Smith?

General SMITH. I would be happy to leave these gentlemen here who are much more expert than I. It is no longer secret, I am sure; it is on the radio that the French Government is appealing for a vote of confidence at the moment and may fall. And there have been during the night exchanges. I am afraid the Russian monitoring service is having a field day this morning and the French Prime Minister will by now have made an extremely important statement about a three-power conference.

So if I might leave my associates who are really expert, and if you would be good enough to excuse me, as long as the Secretary is away I would be most grateful to you.

Mr. CELLER. Your aides will remain for questioning?

General SMITH. If you like.

Mr. GRAHAM. General, before you go, there are three members of the general committee who are here and we are honored with their presence I know they would like to ask you something but I am satisfied that they will be perfectly satisfied to ask your assistants. We want to thank you; we want you to know we have appreciated a great deal the contribution you made this morning. We are sorry that you must go.

General SMITH. You are most kind. I must say I have been dealing with men who are much more expert than I and I know that Mr. Celler and Mr. Walter are people who know the problem.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will see you another time.

General SMITH. Thank you very much, indeed. If you would like these gentlemen to remain, they will answer technical questions and work on them just as much as you like; they do not work as hard as I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Now, I will repeat the question I asked of the general: Who are these refugees, if you know?

Mr. GRAHAM. Will you pardon me just a minute before you start? Will you identify yourself for the record?

Mr. GRAY. This is Mr. Maney who is head of the Visa Office in the Department of State; Mr. Horowitz from the European Regional Affairs Office, and Mr. George Warren whom you probably know, our specialist on refugees. My name is George Gray. I am from the Division of Congressional Relations.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Warren, when we were engaged in the drafting of the security provisions in the Displaced Persons Act, we were encouraged to find that the information our security officials required was readily available. Fortunately, when the United States forces marched into Berlin, they took what is known as the Berlin Document Center. In that center Mr. Hitler had a complete dossier on everybody in Germany, knew all about them. Now how will we determine that these expellees, the new arrivals, are not plants and were not on yesterday active members of the communist movement?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Walter, it is planned under the committee print that all of this security, all the security agencies and all the security procedures that now apply to the granting of a visa to the United States would be utilized to the full, even to the extent of adding additional personnel to accomplish the required processing in that area.

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt you at that point? Will you turn to page 9, section 10?

No alien shall be issued a visa  
and so forth,

unless there shall have been first a thorough investigation by such agency or agencies of the United States as may be designated by the President regarding such person's character, history, and eligibility under this act.

Now, how can a thorough investigation be made of someone that you know nothing about? You ask him who he is and why are you now in our zone in Berlin. He says, "I have been chased out of Russia" and that is all we know. Or he has been chased out of the eastern zone of Berlin.

Mr. WARREN. Presumably the visa would not be issued in any case in which such an investigation had not been completed.

Mr. WALTER. How could you make an investigation, and let us assume that this person is planted; actually, it would be a very simple matter for him to produce forged documents or credentials.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps Mr. Maney could answer that more intelligently than I could. I realize you cannot make an investigation quickly. But it seems to me—

Mr. WALTER. You cannot make it at all if there is not some place where you can get facts concerning the applicant for a visa.

Mr. WARREN. I think, Mr. Walter, in actual experience they do develop a good deal of information after the individual has been in the area some time.

Mr. WALTER. But the police records and all the records in the community in which he resided are not available because our authorities cannot go behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, and where this information and the required material cannot be developed, obviously the person could not qualify under the act.

Mr. WALTER. Of course it is an exaggeration but it is entirely possible that every one of the 110,000 people contemplated to be admitted in that category could be Communists or were Communists on yesterday. Is that not true?

Mr. WARREN. It is conceivable, I assume.

Mr. WALTER. It is conceivable.

Mr. WARREN. But the 110,000—

Mr. WALTER. How many would be, Mr. Warren?

Mr. WARREN. I could not venture a guess.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know, either but I would not be willing to take a chance on such a situation.

Mr. WARREN. The expellees, for instance, who constitute a large proportion, have been there now since 1945 and 1946.

Mr. WALTER. Would it not be more sensible to take those people? After all, we are trying to relieve Germany of that hard core of what do they call them, unresettlables—is that what it was?—but there were around 9 million people. Eight million they are absorbing in their economy. There is that 1 million hard core that could not be resettled. Why would it not be preferable to direct our efforts toward that group who can be screened and about whom we know a great deal, past and present, and pay no attention to recent arrivals?

Mr. WARREN. That is what is intended under the expellee category. They are the expellees. They are persons of German ethnic origin who constituted the former German minorities, prewar German minorities in the Eastern European countries. The persons whom we were concerned about among that 8 or 9 million are approximately a million and a quarter peasant farmers who came from Eastern European countries about 1945 or 1946 into Germany and who cannot now find land to cultivate in Germany and desire to continue in agriculture. They are excellent peasant stock. Seventy percent of that group, Mr. Chairman, you must realize, have already been very well absorbed and not completely, not on the standard of living that they achieved in their countries of origin before the war, but 70 percent have been reasonably absorbed. It is this million and a quarter of landless peasants that constitute the bulk of the problem in Germany.

Mr. WALTER. Would the 57,000 tragic cases that were in the pipeline at the expiration of the displaced persons program be given any kind of a preference in this category?

Mr. WARREN. No preference is stated in the print but they are included among the escapees.

Mr. WALTER. Were they people for whom assurances were obtained months ago?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir; and they are certainly included under the category, escapees, although they are not especially identified, I imagine in order not to make the legislation too complicated.



Mr. WALTER. In this committee print, Mr. Warren, 110,000 Germans combines both the expellees and the escapees.

Mr. WARREN. That is correct. Also both in Germany and in Austria.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that.

Now, which group would be given a preference? In other words, could the 110,000 be used up by just expellees without any attention being paid to the escapees?

Mr. WARREN. That is possible under the existing print—whether there would be some instruction under the legislation later, but in the discussion in the Department that we have had on this problem, we would assume that it would make sense to divide the 110,000, roughly 90,000 in Germany and 20,000 in Austria, which is subject to revision of course, but on the thinking we have done up to date.

Mr. WALTER. Are not the provisions in the Celler bill preferable? There is a division, of course—3 years; but there is 100,000 for expellees and 64,000 available for the escapees.

Mr. CELLER. I put that in so there would be no question as to what numbers should be taken of each class.

Mr. WARREN. Yes, but very roughly, just to give you the intent, you might roughly assign 90,000 to Germany and 20,000 to Austria. Out of the 90,000 in Germany, you might roughly assign 10,000 to the non-German escapees and 80,000 to the expellees.

Mr. WALTER. How would you do it, by the application of what rule?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know whether you could do that under regulations. The committee might write it down in the print if in its discretion it thought it wise to do so.

Mr. WALTER. This committee is allergic to bureaucrats and we like to spell things out instead of having them in regulations, if it is possible.

Mr. WARREN. But such an allocation, it is just a suggestion—such an allocation would have some bearing upon the problem in the two countries, the relative size of the problem in the two countries.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. May I ask at that point?

Mr. GRAHAM. The bell is about to ring over on the floor and we are called there on the appropriation bill, I think for labor, a very important bill. In the event we break up suddenly in a rush to get over there, there are two things I wish to state. The first is that tomorrow we will continue these hearings. The witness who will not be heard this morning, Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Assistant Director for Refugees and Migration, Mutual Security Administration, will be the first witness provided, of course, we finish with you gentlemen here. Then we will have a new list of witnesses tomorrow. At the conclusion of the hearings tomorrow, we will recess until some day next week in order to assimilate and digest what we have heard here so with that understanding and in the event we break up suddenly when the bell rings, you will understand what the situation is.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Warren, I understand you are in charge of the State Department emergency program?

Mr. WARREN. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. And the Congress has indicated an intention by passing a provision in effect stating that we are to appropriate \$100

million to encourage people from behind the Iron Curtain to escape into free nations, is that correct?

Mr. WARREN. That is the Kersten amendment.

Mr. CELLER. The Kersten amendment. Now, would it not be rather anomalous if we say that they should escape and then if we, on the other hand, do nothing after they do escape, is that correct, do nothing in the sense that we are willing to take some of them? Would it not be rather anomalous if we did not provide something?

Mr. WARREN. I think it would, Mr. Celler. It seems to me that one very important consideration in this proposed legislation is the fact that it is pretty well established as a policy that we are encouraging and continue to encourage the countries of first asylum, to continue to grant asylum to refugees. When you consider the political and economic and geographic position of those countries, Germany, Austria, Greece, Turkey, Trieste, and Italy, it does seem illogical as you suggest, Mr. Celler, that we should expect those countries to continue to absorb the numbers that they have in the economic distress in which they are functioning without at the same time helping them by taking some of them off their hands and assisting in absorbing them.

Another consideration, Mr. Chairman, is that as long as they flow in these numbers into these countries of first asylum where they cannot be employed, they cannot be employed because of the economic levels, even as you may conceive them in the future, cannot absorb them, and if they continue to be unemployed and unoccupied, they naturally will tend to become a destructive element in the economy. However, they are normal people in the main. There are, of course, security risks among them. But in the main they are very high-grade, normal people, peasant farmers, persons of working age and all sorts of skills; and it will be helpful to the free west to make the period of their waiting for employment as short as possible by getting them to countries where their services can be used.

Mr. CELLER. Are we not always confronted with the difficulty not only with escapees but with any other intended immigrant with reference to security test which would be impervious to defects. We cannot have a security check perfect. There will be always some subversive creeping in no matter how rigorously we may test. Is that not correct?

Mr. WARREN. I think it is reduced to a minimum, Mr. Celler. You cannot make it one hundred percent perfect, I suppose.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to escapees versus surplus population, taking the case of Italy, I would like to ask you this question: What would it avail us if we pour wealth and economic assistance into Italy where there is surplus population if the overpopulation would nullify the effect of that aid? What is your comment on that?

Mr. WARREN. I think that is true, Mr. Celler. One of the motivations I think of the Congress and of this committee in taking the initiative in setting up the migration committee at Brussels was to assist in the removal from those areas of persons who could not, whose services could not be productive and it is in our self interest, concerned as we are with the economic deficits in those countries, to remove from them those who cannot contribute through their production to those economies.

Mr. CELLER. Now, be a little more specific. How would it not avail us if we do not siphon off some of that surplus population and then keep pouring economic wealth into Italy? Must we do both, in other words?

Mr. WARREN. We are just continuing a problem which we will have to continue to have to relieve through economic assistance.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, is not this an important factor: when that committee meets under the chairmanship of Mr. Hugh Gibson, it knows the restraints under which the representative on that committee of the United States operates? He might make a promise to do something but unless Congress approves, his promise is unavailing; is that not correct?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Celler, I never make promises.

Mr. WALTER. Nobody knows any better than Mr. Warren because he is the United States representative.

Mr. CELLER. That is why I am asking him. When you are vis-à-vis the other representatives of other nations, they have not got our constitutional system, so unless Congress makes the gesture or unless Congress does something, there is very little that you can do?

Mr. WARREN. I cannot go and extend beyond that, naturally; obviously, I cannot go a step beyond the authorization of the Congress.

Mr. WALTER. Will you yield just at that point? As a matter of fact, have you not observed that every representative of every nation participating in that movement never gave an answer without getting on the long-distance telephone or the cable to find out what his government would permit him to do, so that in that respect your positions were identical?

Mr. CELLER. That is not quite true because those representatives of other nations could contact their foreign office or the department having jurisdiction over immigration or emigration, and that department would have power in many respects. But the State Department has no power whatsoever. It is the Congress that has the reservoir of power in that respect.

Mr. WARREN. I would not say, Mr. Celler. I think Mr. Walter is correct that the other representatives, the other representatives of other governments, to the committee are functioning under the same controls and limitations that the United States representative does. They attend those committee sessions under specific instructions and while those may be very general sometimes in terms of the expression of the objectives to be achieved, I do not feel that I am at any disadvantage in the presence of my other colleagues on that account.

Mr. CELLER. Now, I attended a meeting, probably Mr. Walter did, too—I am sure he did—I do not think you were present, in December, of the intergovernmental committee, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration over which Mr. Gibson presided. I interrogated him concerning the representatives from other nations and from the responses they gave me, I saw an evident intention on the part of those many nations to cooperate with Mr. Gibson and with the United States Government most earnestly by way of siphoning off surplus populations and giving asylum to refugees and escapees.

Furthermore, I want to say in answer to inquiries made by the gentleman from California, Mr. Hillings, that I had earnest conversations with Count Giusti who is head of the emigration service of

the Italian Government and I was not satisfied with his oral statements. I asked him to show me some of the records, the official records of their emigration service as to whether they were attempting to dump only unskilled labor upon the American market or elsewhere. And I found evidence that not only unskilled labor but many skilled laborers and scientists and other professional people were emigrating out of Italy, not within our quota but to other nations as well. So I think it would be unfair to let the impression remain in the record that Italy was only seeking to get rid of its, shall we say, undesirables. There may be some cases of undesirables beyond question, but in the main I want to state that Italy has reacted to this matter in a very forthright, honest, and decent way.

Mr. GRAHAM. Time is running out on us. Mr. Crumpacker, are there any questions you would like to ask?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. On page 3, section 4, subparagraph 2, of the committee print, is provided a quota of 15,000 visas for escapees. Is that intended to apply primarily to non-Germanic nationals of Eastern European countries?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Who have escaped to the Western Zone.

Mr. WARREN. Very few Germans in those areas.

Mr. WILLIS. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned Louisiana a while ago, I remember well the boatload of displaced persons who landed in New Orleans; a large portion of them settled in my district in the sugarcane belt. Oddly enough, they were working alongside some of their brothers who had come to my State in the last half of the century and were well contented there. They told us very heart-breaking stories, and that made news. It went through the press and in the light of that background and the southern hospitality, we received them with open arms.

Then in a matter of days, they started to say, well, they were not used to the customs and surroundings, and that again was spread out with some sympathy. Then after a while they said, well they were not used to that kind of hard work, harvesting sugarcane. That did not take so well, but some folks who had sponsored them took up on their side, and finally the coup d'etat was that they were paid, so it was said, starvation wages; could not live there. Well they worked or maneuvered themselves into a position of getting away. Some felt it was good riddance anyway.

Now, however, they did something else. They left a seed of discontent among those who have been working there for a long, long time. So I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said about admitting, as this bill does, folks from behind the Iron Curtain that we would not be able to send our FBI in the neighborhood to find out who they are. I do not know what the sentiments will be for that category.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Wilson of Texas.

Mr. WILSON. In my State, while we did not get too much complaint, the situation was about the same as Mr. Willis says in his State.

Isn't there, and some of you gentlemen ought to know, somewhere between 65 and 70 million overpopulation in Europe? Is that about right?

Mr. WARREN. Our estimate of the what you might consider the unabsorbable population in Europe, taking into account the present or foreseeable levels of economy, is somewhere in the neighborhood of three and a half to five million.

Mr. WILSON. Unabsorbable. That restricts the definition of the thing I am getting at considerably, then. For instance, when this subcommittee was in Munich, Stuttgart, Berlin, several other places in Germany, we held hearings. At that time they said there were some 9 million escapees and refugees who had come in, ethnic Germans who had come back into Germany. Many of those witnesses, prominent Germans, through interpreters and otherwise, some of them talked good English, said that they did not favor the policy where the other nations of the world would come in and skim off the cream of those people and take them out of Germany, that that was not what they were looking for at all. All they wanted, all they needed to absorb those people right there in Germany was some money, some credit, so that they could go back into business and go to work and we found some of those Czechoslovakians in one little German town—Schwaebisch Gmund—we found those folks had taken old, second-hand half-horsepower motors, setting them up and were doing the most beautiful cutglass work and blowing glass and they have been glassblowers back in Czechoslovakia, had gone into business on scraps and old tin buildings and were doing a good business. They were complaining at that time that the Czechoslovakian Communists who took over their business by theft were shipping their goods to this country whereas they were penalized by tariff and they could not do the same thing and they were penalized by reason of it.

To get down to my question with regard to the Italians, do you have any fear under this print that either one of two things will happen such as Mr. Walter has just related about Canada where it would be a great deal of pressure on the ruling political party or those in charge, a desire to get rid of their opposition, there would be a lot of that, would there not?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think so.

Mr. WILSON. If they send undesirables to Canada, you would not have to stretch your imagination too much to see how they would want to send some over here. If they did that, we would not want them, would we?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Mr. WILSON. Criminals and undesirables, not just unskilled labor. We can use a lot of unskilled labor in this country. As a matter of fact, down in the valley where these wetbacks come across four or five hundred thousand of them—no American will do that work. So the unskilled laborer is all right if he is honest and if he is assimilable and if he will come in and learn to be an American instead of remaining Italian after he gets here. But if we take the converse of that and they send the best people out of Italy, those who are fighting communism now, who is going to be left to fight communism if we take all good people? That is two dilemmas.

Mr. WARREN. I do not think, sir, that we are going to take all the good people or all the dregs. What we are going to take are those who desire to leave. From my knowledge of the practice of the Italian Government, the Italian Government does not interpose any

interference in the operation of the recruiting missions of the immigration countries in Italy. They are free to select the persons that they are interested in.

Now, it is true, it may be true—I am not well advised on it—that there are undoubtedly certain trained, skilled people whom the Italian Government has in short supply. Naturally, they are not going to be enthusiastic over losing them. I admit immediately that Canada has not had completely 100 percent perfect experience in receiving all of the people that she wants.

Mr. WALTER. Why did they cut off their quota, their program?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think they have, Mr. Walter. I know they have complained and I know a good deal about that. But Canada is at the present time recruiting Italians for labor in track work in western Canada on an increasing scale.

Now, I would be the first one to grant that the processing procedures in Italy are not 100 percent perfect. And occasionally you will get someone who is not all that you would like him to be.

Mr. WILSON. In some of these areas—I have been to Italy twice and 11 other European countries, and as I said, with this committee once. In some of these camps, some of these processing points, we heard them interrogating and screening some of these folks and we stood behind curtains to listen, and of course they carried them through very exhaustive questioning. If they happened to be Germans who lived in Germany and had a record on them, as Mr. Walter said, when they captured the records of all the Germans they had—girls, boys—everybody. They knew exactly what youth organizations they belonged to and all those things and had it on record. They knew nearly when a man got on a train and took a visit down someplace.

But when you take nationalities, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, Estonians, Bulgarians, Hungarians and Czechoslovakians where the Russians are in charge of the record, all they can do and those folks told us all we can do is if he has lived 2, 3, 4, 5 years, if he has had a pretty good record in the displaced persons camp, that is all we know about him. That is all they could know about him unless it happened to be somebody else in camp who lived in the same town with him and either squeal on him or lie about his having a good record; so they had to take somebody's word. It is a very unsatisfactory way of screening and we would be faced with the same situation with regard to these East Germans because they have suffered, a lot of those people have turned to communism. They might have finally decided, well, it is getting-out time because the Communists turned on some of their satellites at times, some of those that have aided them. There would be no way in the world we could know how an East German or person from East Berlin or the East German Zone, what his conduct has been, whether he has been an active Communist, whether he has gotten converts to it, whether he was passing or just went along because he had to get a bread ticket or something else. We could not find out, could we?

Mr. WARREN. All of that is true, sir, and we are under no obligation to take anyone as to whom we are not perfectly satisfied by such investigation as we can make—not issue visas blindly.

Mr. CELLER. I noticed the gentleman from Texas expressed his concern about the screening of 37,500 Italians a year, making a total of 75,000. That is not very much when you consider the entire popula-

tion of Italy. I do not think the gentleman from Texas is as much concerned with screening when it comes to wetbacks when they come across the border, several hundred thousand a year. We do not have much screening there. I am rather amazed at the gentleman's concern now with the——

Mr. WILSON. That is an entirely different proposition. I believe that many of the Italians are as good as anybody else. I think, though, that there would be a disposition on the part of those folks under pressure to send their undesirables and send those who did not agree with them.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WALTER. I could give you the names of people—I could; I won't—who talked with Italian officials, who stated that the only people they permitted to leave were the people that they did not want.

Mr. WILSON. I heard that same thing in Italy.

Now with regard to wetbacks, I want to ask you something about that. This is not a wetback bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Wilson, our time is running out. That would appear to be a collateral issue injected here. Mr. Walter would like to ask one question. Can you take this up tomorrow?

Mr. WALTER. Just this one question, Mr. Warren. In considering question of refugees, the world-wide question, don't you think we ought to consider the question of the plight of the Arab refugees as well as these others?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir; they are entitled to consideration.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you think they should be included in any kind of a measure that we act on, if we do?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know whether we have time to answer that or not.

Mr. WALTER. I withdraw the question.

Mr. WILSON. May I ask just one question and I know it is on a more or less collateral issue. Why couldn't we, gentlemen, and I want to know if any of you disagree with this, why couldn't we set up a system of work permits on the Mexican border, Arizona and California, just like they have got in Canada? Why would that not solve all this wetback problem?

Mr. MANEY. We do have the system.

Mr. WILSON. You mean this agricultural labor law?

Mr. MANEY. That and the H-petition under the general law, the temporary worker. The difficulty there is that a man has trouble getting a passport from the Mexican Government. He finds it easier to wade the river.

Mr. WILSON. Don't you have such a system as they work on the Canadian border that works so well?

Mr. MANEY. The Canadian is not supposed to work unless he gets a petition approved by the Department of Justice. We waived visas but they are not supposed to work here.

Mr. WILSON. Don't they do the same thing on a properly screened Mexican who works and wants to work here and people needing him to work and willing to pay a fair wage?

Mr. MANEY. We have the provision. They can petition for temporary work permits.

Mr. WILSON. It is not working very well, is it? It does not keep the river-walking wetback from getting a job, does it?

Mr. CELLER. One question more. In the bill I propose, I provide that the administrative machinery for these requests for admission shall be within the four squares of the State Department as it now exists. That the administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs shall be, shall we say for want of a better word, the spark-plug of this whole proposition. But in the committee print there is set up a new agency and it is presided over by an emergency migration coordinator who is to receive compensation, according to the print, of \$17,500. Why do you set up a new office for this purpose? Why can't all this be done within the present framework of the State Department?

Mr. HOROWITZ. Mr. Celler, the intention of that section was to provide for the coordination of all of the specific and special kinds of problems that arise in a program of this sort, particularly the kinds of problems that have been referred to with respect to the organizing and the obtaining of assurances, relations with all of the agencies that would be concerned with that, the voluntary agencies, and the public and State officials.

Mr. CELLER. Could not present officials of the State Department do the same thing?

Mr. HOROWITZ. The setting up of the coordinator was left, as you note in section 5 of the print, to the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who then in his discretion could assign that to the State Department, to another agency, or set it up as an independent office.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee is adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the meeting was adjourned.)



# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

---

FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:00 a. m. in Room 346, Old House Office Building, Hon. Louis E. Graham, Chairman, presiding.

Present: Messrs. Graham, Hillings, Miss Thompson, Messrs. Reed, Crumpacker, Walter, Wilson.

Also present: Mr. Walter Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee will be in order.

The Chair desires to make a preliminary statement. When we adjourned yesterday, the time of the meeting of the House was fixed at 11 o'clock today, which will necessitate a very short hearing this morning.

In addition to that, certain members of the subcommittee have been invited to the White House to witness the signing of the Submerged Land Act. Of course, we are all going.

With that in mind, we had planned to hear Mr. Durkin first, Mr. Morse next and Mrs. Houghton last.

Now, I would like to make this additional suggestion. Five members of this committee have been abroad and they know this situation pretty well. We could save time if those who are to testify would submit their statements for the record and to comment briefly. However, this is entirely up to the witnesses. We will try to do all we can, but under the time limitations, we will probably have to leave here and adjourn not later than quarter to eleven.

Now, before calling the first witness, I would like the following telegrams, both addressed to me, to appear in the record. Both are dated May 21, 1953.

The first one is from John B. Trevor, president emeritus of the American Coalition. [Reading:]

I have just learned that you are presiding over the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, and that the subject of consideration is the President's Message on the State of the Union in respect to immigration legislation.

With all respect to the President, the message demonstrates that he has been misinformed and misled regarding the nature and the fundamental purpose of the quota system now in force.

The paragraph of the President's message reading: "There is one sphere in which civil rights are inevitably involved in Federal legislation. This is the sphere of immigration." This statement is misleading as the Constitution of the United States conveys no civil rights to the alien to enter or remain in the United States. The privilege to enter and remain in the United States is conveyed by statute. This privilege of entering or remaining may be withdrawn or modified in any way which Congress may determine is for the best interests of the United States.

The statement in the fourth paragraph of the President's message that the "existing legislation contains injustices" is devoid of any sound basis in fact. The McCarran-Walter Act, of course, embodies provisions which deny certain privileges to aliens which were regarded by the authors as essential for the welfare of the United States, and which no alien is justified in demanding as a matter of right.

Furthermore, let me say that the statement that the McCarran-Walter Act "does, in fact, discriminate" was made by the President obviously without any knowledge of what the facts in reality are. This error is emphasized by the recommendation that further study of the proper method of determining quotas would be necessary.

The President is obviously unaware of the fact that the quota system embodied in the McCarran-Walter Act has not only been under study by the experts employed by the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate during the past 5 years, but also he must be unaware that the quota system it provides for was originally perfected as a result of a wholly independent study by experts of the Department of State, Commerce and Labor during the years 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928. The purpose of the quota system proclaimed as a result of the findings of these experts was adopted to abolish for all times any grounds for a charge that Congress was discriminating against any nation, race, or creed which had contributed to the overwhelming mass of our population derived by entry or descent from immigrants or European origins.

Permit me to add that the legislation recently introduced, as I understand it, at the President's request to admit 240,000 refugees represents the very essence of discrimination, and in effect nullifies the fundamental purpose for which the national origins quota system was adopted. As I have given prolonged study, as you may recall, to these questions, I regret that I am not well enough to appear before your committee in person. However, permit me to urge that your committee disapprove the recommendations of the President in respect to the McCarran-Walter Act and disapprove his recommendations in regard to refugees. When the soldiers are turned loose from our Armed Forces, they will properly resent any action by Congress by which jobs to which they may rightfully claim priority of consideration have been allotted to foreigners.

The other telegram is from Nicholas G. Caranfil, chairman of the Romanian Welfare, Inc.

"YOUR HONOR: On behalf of Romanian Welfare, Inc., 145 East 52d Street, New York City, permit us express our hope that your committee will give favorable consideration to bill providing for admission 240,000 refugees and escapees. Approval of emergency legislation would relieve hundreds worthy Rumanian refugees and families in Germany, Italy, France from terrible plight caused by inability of host countries provide employment. In event program suggested President Eisenhower would not receive congressional approval we beg you consider at least amendment McCarran Act increasing exaggeratedly small Eastern European quotas. Increase of quota would be humanitarian as well as political act indicating enslaved Rumanians American concern for their countrymen successful in escaping Communist yoke.

We will now hear from Mr. Martin P. Durkin, Secretary of Labor. We are glad to have you, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN P. DURKIN, SECRETARY OF LABOR

MR. DURKIN. Mr. Chairman, the President on April 22, 1953, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House calling for the enactment of emergency immigration legislation concerning the problem which the mounting thousands of refugees, escapees, and others in free Europe poses for us. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you on this matter. I know that you have had occasion to give searching and extended consideration over the past years to the nature of the problems involved.

Permit me to say that I welcome the opportunity to lend unreserved and wholehearted endorsement to the basic purposes of this

special program and the techniques which it provides for their accomplishment. I note that last Friday on the Senate side, Senator Watkins as chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, introduced S. 1917, which was cosponsored by a number of other distinguished Senators. This type of bill would, in my opinion, present a sound basis for legislation.

There is one rather unusual feature in this program. Most of us find that, ordinarily, in both personal and national affairs, the appraisal of a proposed course of action means balancing the advantages against the disadvantages. In this case, however, I am unable to find any real disadvantages in the program or any real threat to the interests of our people at home, in whatever walk of life. Its enactment would, I believe, prove mutually profitable to us and our friends in the free nations across the Atlantic, without at the same time calling for any sacrifice on our part. There are certainly enough other occasions when action which our judgment prompts us to take is both painful and costly. Fortunately, however, that is not the case here. Opportunities of this kind should not be passed over.

There is one point I should like to review briefly. Suppose the Congress authorizes the admission of a special quota of 240,000 Europeans over a period of 2 years, under the safeguards provided in this program. Would this prejudice the job security of American citizens in the factory or on the farm? The answer on both counts is an emphatic "No".

Take first the situation in industry. Our economy has shown a resiliency through the postwar years that has surprised and disappointed our enemies. We hardly need the statistician to tell us that both our population and the standard of living which it enjoys are at an alltime high.

It is useful, however, to pinpoint this fact: A special quota of 120,000 per year would mean an estimated addition of 60,000 persons to our total labor force. This smaller figure is due to the fact that at least half of those who will enter will be wives and dependents of working wage earners. The labor force now consists of over 66 million persons, and is being increased by about 800,000 each year. Unemployment is also at an alltime low in relation to population and work force. In other words, we could anticipate from this limited program an added trickle of actually less than one-tenth of 1 percent into the massive pipeline of workers that man our industrial and agricultural enterprises.

We might even narrow the focus for a moment to the critical manpower needs of national security. Defense employment now stands at 6 million—3 times what it was when American fighting forces first saw combat in Korea. Consider 60,000 workers a year alongside of this figure or in relation to the soaring demands that would be imposed by full mobilization, if that comes.

This analysis is confirmed by the reaction of the major labor organizations in this country. They would naturally be highly sensitive to any possible impairment from outside of the employment security of their members. Yet organized labor has joined in support of special programs of the kind embodied in the emergency legislation now being considered by the committee. It is a familiar fact to you and a reassuring one to me, that both the AFL and the CIO have on a number of occasions gone on record to this effect.

So far as agriculture is concerned, there are simply not enough farmhands available to meet our needs. This is the situation in spite of the accelerated tempo of recruiting activities by the United States Employment Service. To mention one factor, industry and the Armed Forces continue to siphon off substantial numbers of male farm laborers. Several agricultural sections of the country suffered labor shortages last year and this is expected again. Employers need various kinds of help including trained dairy hands, animal ranch hands, general farmhands, and farm couples. The total numbers needed are estimated by some to be as high as 200,000 based upon an equivalent decrease of regular hired workers on farms in recent years. In fact farming operations in several areas, such as dairying in Wisconsin and New England, have been reduced because of manpower losses. The program before you would give preference to farmworkers among others. There is every reason to welcome whatever help it may provide in the difficult task of overcoming the shortage of these workers.

The critical shortages of certain skills in industry also stand to be alleviated in some measure by the entry of the trained persons who will be accorded priority. Today, the country urgently needs more than 6,000 machine operators, 4,000 professional engineers, 2,000 machinists, and an equal number of tool and die makers, to cite just a few examples. There are many other classifications on the list of those in short supply.

So much for the facts about our national employment picture and how it might be affected by the proposed program. If Congress decides that it should be carried out, you have this assurance. The staff of my Department is prepared to assume its proper role alongside of other interested agencies of the Government, in insuring the most effective administration possible of the statute. A good many lessons have been learned from the operations of the displaced persons program which was terminated last year. This is all to the good.

For example, in the employment field the program being considered by the Committee gives preference to farm workers and to others who possess services or skills needed in the United States. The Department of Labor, which coordinates our Federal-State system of public employment services, would be instrumental in certifying these needs. Also, as Senator Watkins has correctly emphasized, the program contemplates occupational screening of immigrants by officials of the United States. This is in the best interests not only of those admitted under the program but also in the best interests of the United States.

It was only in the latter stages of the displaced persons program that trained interviewers from the Federal and State employment service were sent to Europe to work with the voluntary agencies to help match the candidates against the job assurances that were outstanding. I might add that county farm agents who spoke the native tongue of the refugees they interviewed, made an invaluable contribution.

We know, too, that many of the persons who were resettled here under the old program, did not stay on the job because of lack of proper selection and this was later recognized by the voluntary agencies which participated in the program. It would make use at the outset of an employment service which is geared to the requirements of American industry and agriculture. I believe that this

approach holds great promise with respect to the screening and selection of the prospective immigrants who are not being sponsored by relatives or close friends. Employer job assurances developed on this side of the ocean on the basis of particular skills required in particular places would go to our personnel on the other side who have the know-how in this specialized work. We may expect that these job orders will then be realistically matched with the worker who meets the specifications.

I hope that what I have said provides assurances that American interests need not and will not suffer. I am inclined to go farther, however, in the belief that we may anticipate some very real dividends from the skillful execution of this program. Our present experience indicates that we may expect to attract some skilled workers and persons with much needed scientific and technical skills. And we benefit also from the unskilled who take their places in industry and agriculture. Furthermore, these people will, I am sure, contribute to the betterment of America as useful and industrious wage earners, as taxpayers, and eventually as citizens of our country.

Finally, we recognize that this program is designed to protect our own citizens from outside pressures in employment, in housing, and in any drain on public charities; it guards against the infiltration of subversives; and it seeks, through good planning, to insure that the immigrant is well received. But beyond all this, I personally share the serious conviction apparent in the President's message and in the statements of the preceding witnesses. It is in keeping with our tradition to give some modest measure of hope to the victims of tyranny. At the same time the program presents a sensible and economical way of relieving some of the already dense population pressures on friendly governments. That which saps the vitality of Germany, Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, and other European nations important to our defensive posture, may ultimately affect our own.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Durkin, may I inquire of you, how much time have you at your disposal? We know you are needed elsewhere and we do not want to impose upon you.

Mr. DURKIN. About 10 minutes or so.

Mr. GRAHAM. With that in mind, we will take first the members of the committee.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Secretary, I take it that is a basic point in your testimony, the fact that you see no danger to workers in this country from the bringing in of the number of immigrants requested in the President's message to Congress, is that correct?

Mr. DURKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HILLINGS. You do not feel that there is going to be any objection to this legislation on the part of either the A. F. of L. or the CIO?

Mr. DURKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HILLINGS. Have you had any positive communication from labor organizations as to their attitude on this specific legislation aside from the position you have taken in the matter?

Mr. DURKIN. No action has been taken by the executive council but we have met with representatives, legislative representatives of the A. F. of L. and the CIO and they see no objection to the legislation.

Mr. HILLINGS. It is also your feeling that it would be possible in

this type of program to prevent any subversives from coming into the country under this program, have you given very much thought to that?

Mr. DURKIN. I believe it will be controlled because the Immigration and Nationality Act governs.

Miss THOMPSON. These people that will be brought into these countries will be primarily farm hands, is that not the intent, and of course would give no difficulty so far as the skilled workers are concerned?

Mr. DURKIN. No, there would be others brought in with skills that we can use. We are short in the fields, as I have stated, of skilled classifications and in crafts and they can be brought in under this program.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Secretary, what is the attitude of the United Mine Workers toward bringing unskilled workers to this country who might conceivably find their way into the coal region?

Mr. DURKIN. I have not heard of any objection by them. I have not heard of any support of this bill as yet.

Mr. WALTER. Have you talked with any representatives?

Mr. DURKIN. No, I have not.

Mr. WALTER. With whom did you discuss this measure in the A. F. of L.?

Mr. DURKIN. There was a Mr. Mason representing the A. F. of L., Walter Mason.

Mr. WALTER. Walter Mason; that is the man who participated in the drafting of the immigration bill, is it not?

Now, you have stated that you see no danger to the workers of America by bringing these people in if we enact this legislation. What about the three million men in the armed services who we hope will not be there much longer? What effect would this admission of large numbers of aliens have on their opportunities to obtain employment after they are released from the armed services?

Mr. DURKIN. I do not believe it would have any great effect.

Mr. WALTER. Where will these people be located if they come?

Mr. DURKIN. They would be located in the areas where there is need. In other words, the agencies would solicit employers for job opportunities for those people. If they needed help, then they would place the orders with the employment service within the State so that there would be a proper description of the job duties, giving all the conditions of employment including wages and then the Department would determine as to whether or not there is available help in the area or in the Nation to fill the order before any order would be sent across the sea in order to select persons who are capable and competent to satisfy the employer.

Mr. WALTER. You believe that these workers would then remain where they were settled?

Mr. DURKIN. I believe that they would remain because they would be fitted into the work that they have had, that they have performed in the country which they were drawn from.

Mr. WALTER. As an example of how mistaken you appear to be in that assumption, I would like to call your attention to the experience that people had in this very community during the later days of the displaced persons program when you state that greater care was ex-

exercised in the selection of people and for that reason the settlements were better.

A number of farmers—these people were farmhands in Europe, victims of the Nazi persecution—were brought here, settled on farms, and within days found employment at the Indian Head military establishment in Maryland, employment offered by the Government, and left the farms. And presumably they are still employed in Indian Head.

Now, they were people carefully selected, everyone of them, as agriculturalists. But they did not stay in the jobs on which they were placed. The point is this: shortly, I hope and pray, there will not be the need for this expanded activity at Indian Head. Now, when that day arrives, what is going to happen to these people?

Mr. DURKIN. I believe that they will find their way into industry. I think when the war ends, if you want to call it war, I believe that we are going to prosper as a nation in time of peace as we did previous to war.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, I think that is true. But where will these people go when their employment terminates at Indian Head?

Mr. DURKIN. I do not know whether the Indian Head project will curtail to the point at which they close down entirely but they will find employment elsewhere just the same as others will.

Mr. WALTER. That, or they will go on relief.

Mr. DURKIN. I do not expect that we are going to have a situation that we are going to have any relief in the very near future.

Mr. WALTER. I invite you to come to the State of Pennsylvania if that happens and take a look at the anthracite coal regions.

Mr. DURKIN. I might state that in the anthracite coal region. I don't think we will send anyone to that area.

Mr. WALTER. You won't send them there but they will find their way because they all have relatives there and that is exactly where they go, where their relatives are. You were not here on yesterday to hear Mr. Willis testify as to the experience they had in Louisiana. And unfortunately, they are encouraged to do that by these foreign language newspapers.

Mr. DURKIN. We will not encourage them to go to the mining regions.

Mr. WALTER. You do not have to. You will not encourage them to go into large cities where old boyhood friends and childhood friends reside. But they will find their way there.

Now then, you talked about these skilled people that are needed. A provision is made for that situation under Public Law 414 where a preference is given to the type of people you mention—professional engineers, machinists, tool and die makers, and so forth. They all have a preference under existing law.

Mr. DURKIN. I state that we will get that type of person under this proposed legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Now, I would like to go into this question of screening. You stated Senator Watkins has correctly emphasized that the program contemplates occupational screening of immigrants by officials of the United States. I am talking about security screening.

Mr. DURKIN. We haven't got that under our jurisdiction. We will not have security screening. This is screening to determine the fitness of the person for the job.

Mr. WALTER. What would you say about making these additional numbers available without reference to the 2-year period, merely expanding temporarily the quotas and making it possible for people to be admitted under existing law?

Mr. DURKIN. I believe that I would prefer this other legislation now before you than any expansion of quotas.

Mr. WALTER. You think the quotas should remain as they are?

Mr. DURKIN. I do.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you.

Mr. WILSON. Do you believe as some of the rest of us do that we have to carry on a restricted immigration policy in this country, do you not? Without regard to this bill, I mean?

Mr. DURKIN. Yes; I think that we who represent labor have to consider that, that we do not have our people here in America unemployed while others are coming in, but I say that this bill would not create such a condition.

Mr. WILSON. Do you happen to know, and it might not come under your supervision, do you happen to know what percentage of the people who came in under the Displaced Persons Act said they were farmers?

Mr. DURKIN. I am not familiar.

Mr. WILSON. It was a rather high percentage of them who said they were farmers; is that not so?

Mr. DURKIN. I believe that is the trouble, so many who were industrial workers said they were farmers. Under this bill——

Mr. WILSON. Because they thought that would give them a little better chance to enter this country.

Mr. DURKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. That was a mistake the Congress made. We invited people to make those statements in order to get to the United States.

Mr. DURKIN. But may I state this? It is our intent that we will use the Employment Service in the Nation to make the first determination as to the fitness of the person. After that is done, we will then again interview them to see that they do come, those that come over as farmhands are really farmhands in their native land.

Mr. WILSON. Of course, under our Constitution and under our laws, we have no way to make a man stay on the farm when he comes here. When we let him in, he is a free agent and it is pretty hard for him to stay down here on a farm working for \$5 or \$7 a day—and that is pretty good farm pay, as you know—when there is a factory job right around the corner where his friends live, as Mr. Walter says, some big center of population, where he can make much more money. Is that not so?

Mr. DURKIN. Well, I believe that there is a provision of the proposed bill that is to take care of such cases as that. It would be administered by another department and not by the Department of Labor.

Mr. WILSON. That is all.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Secretary, before you go, just one word. I live in a great industrial section, tremendously large plants—American Rolling Mill, American Bridge Co.; Crucible Steel Co. of America, Jones & Laughlin, and others—a tremendously large population, and our experience has not been unlike that which has been depicted here. They come on the farms in good faith. But when they hear about the



good wages down in the factory, over the hill they go and they are gone. They are done with farm work and they are down in the factories.

So it is just a matter, I think, of adjustment and working out with your help and the help of the others a truly good bill.

I want to thank you very much for your kindness and I hope you will not be late for your appointment.

We will hear now from Mr. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. TRUE D. MORSE, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to appear before your committee to testify in support of the committee print of the Emergency Migration Act of 1953.

The administration in the United States Department of Agriculture shares the concern expressed by the President of the United States in his letter which recommended to Congress:

\* \* \* enactment of emergency immigration legislation for the special admission of 120,000 immigrants per year for the next 2 years.

Over 40 million immigrants, in a relatively short span of years, have helped build our land from a wilderness to one of the most powerful and prosperous nations in the world. Their brains and brawn helped settle the land, advance our agriculture, build our industries, develop our commerce, produce new inventions, and in general make us a leader among the nations.

This emergency measure when enacted would be a further demonstration, by our actions, of our desire to maintain a strong defense against the threat of Communist aggressions.

Some of the agricultural considerations that prompt our support of this proposed legislation are the following:

One, there is no shortage of food in this country, and more people can be supported with high level diets. Additions of gainfully employed people expand the markets for farm products. The primary markets for products of our farms are in the United States.

Two, in section 11, item 1 of the committee print, priorities are given to—

. . . persons who are farmworkers and persons whose services or skills are needed in the United States . . .

Record high rates of employment in the United States in recent years have caused a serious shortage of farmworkers in some of the farming areas. Therefore, there are opportunities for employment of farmworkers, provided the immigrants are effectively located within the primary farming and ranching areas.

Three, the areas from which most of the immigrants would originate, as provided under the proposed legislation, have produced some of our capable farmers through immigrants of past years and their descendants. The legislation would provide for these sources of people:

(a) Escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria, 110,000.

(b) Escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey or in the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside, 15,000.

(c) Nationals of Italy or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste, 75,000.

(d) Nationals of Greece or persons of Greek ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in Greece, 20,000.

(e) Nationals of the Netherlands or persons of Dutch ethnic origin residing on the date of enactment of this act in metropolitan Netherlands, 20,000.

Four, with proper care exercised in the selection and placement of those admitted, there is reason to believe that an important contribution can be made to our total economy. The selections of these persons will be in the hands of American officials who will conform to all of the criteria and requirements enumerated in the present Immigration and Nationality Act for screening those who are ultimately cleared for entry. Also, those entering the United States labor force who are other than blood relatives of American residents will be admitted only when United States employers or approved sponsoring groups have given assurance of employment in fields of endeavor where the Department of Labor has certified a need for workers of particular skills.

In the event this emergency immigration legislation is enacted the Department of Agriculture will stand ready to work with any of the immigrants that are employed in our agricultural economy.

We recommend enactment of the proposed bill as set forth in the committee print, insofar as it affects agriculture.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Secretary, you stated that record high rates of employment in the United States in recent years have caused a serious shortage of farmworkers in some of the farming areas. Then you go on to state, therefore, there are opportunities for employment of farmworkers provided immigrants are effectively located within the primary farming and ranching areas.

How would you accomplish that?

Mr. MORSE. It would need to be accomplished through cooperation with the agricultural workers in these areas and with the people who were responsible for bringing these immigrants in.

Mr. WALTER. Let us assume for the sake of argument that there is a shortage of farm workers in the State of Pennsylvania—of course, there is not—and that the farm workers in the State of Pennsylvania would agree to cooperate, as you just stated. How would we know that these farmers, these farmworkers, would do more than merely go to Pennsylvania and then leave after a short period?

Mr. MORSE. There is no way that you can be assured of that other than through careful selection of the people who come in and through an understanding with them when they were being brought in. Of course if they disregard that responsibility, I assume there is no way to hold them.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Morse, where is this great shortage of farm workers concerning which you have testified?

Mr. MORSE. It would be primarily in the commercial farming areas and especially as they are associated around industrial areas like Ohio, and Michigan, and out through the corn belt. Of course, the Corn Belt is primarily a farming situation. Ranches have been quite short of labor. There has been a shortage of seasonal labor in vegetable-producing areas, in the sugar-beet areas, areas of that kind, where there is a large requirement of hand labor.

Mr. WALTER. That is all seasonal. I am just wondering if the type of people that we are concerned with would take employment when it is seasonal only.

Mr. MORSE. For people coming in permanently like this, it would be desirable first of all to locate them where there is year-around employment for them.

Mr. WALTER. That is in the agricultural-industrial area?

Mr. MORSE. It would be. You take dairy farms that are close to the large industrial areas and, of course where they need the milk; dairy farmers particularly—I use that as just one illustration—are having a hard time in holding sufficient labor.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, when people settle in those particular areas, they are going to be attracted to the metropolitan sections in which they can go to churches, where they meet their friends, relatives from the old country. I am just wondering how we can make sure these people will remain where they are settled.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. It is first of all a matter of selection to know that they are farmers in their experience, if they are headed to a farm job in this country.

Mr. WALTER. But we have had that experience. In the early days of the displaced persons program, we got a lot of people who represented themselves to be agriculturalists and they were not. But later, farmers were selected. They too left the places in which they were settled.

Mr. MORSE. That is a very definite problem. Of course, to the extent that these people move in to other employment, it tends to fill those jobs so that there are fewer farm workers that would be tending to be pulled in, so it tends to stop that flow to that extent but it is a definite problem of holding these people on the farms.

Mr. WALTER. You have not expressed any opinion with respect to security screening?

Mr. MORSE. No, sir. I am not testifying from the standpoint of such screening. I am testifying from the standpoint of agriculture.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you very much.

Mr. MORSE. May I say that location of these people out in the commercial farming areas like Illinois, Iowa, further removed from the industrial centers, gives less temptation for them to go into industrial jobs.

Mr. GRAHAM. The next witness is Mrs. Houghton.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I should like to submit for this record the full statement of the Mutual Security Agency on behalf of President Eisenhower's recommendation to admit into the United States 240,000 from surplus areas in Western Europe during the next 2 years.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. DOROTHY D. HOUGHTON, ASSISTANT  
DIRECTOR FOR REFUGEES AND MIGRATION, OFFICE OF THE  
DIRECTOR FOR MUTUAL SECURITY**

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, last month it was my great privilege to attend the Conference of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration held in Geneva, Switzerland. Representatives from 22 member countries attended. Great optimism developed early at the conference based largely on President Eisenhower's letter to Mr. Hugh Gibson. In his letter, the President had said:

I am fully aware of the need for international action and collaboration in developing opportunities in many countries of the world for those in Europe who desire to emigrate. \* \* \* \* The United States Government fully supports the efforts which the Committee is making to assist those in Europe seeking opportunities for a livelihood in other countries which are in a position to receive them.

Six days later came news of the President's plea to Congress for emergency immigration legislation to admit 240,000 Europeans to the United States in the next 2 years. I only wish it could have been possible for you to have seen the effect of this message upon the entire Conference. They saw in this message proof that the United States understood the problems of Europe's surplus population—not just in terms of money, but of human beings in need of new opportunities. Already Australia, Canada, and some Latin American countries had announced ambitious plans to admit European migrants to their shores during the coming year. President Eisenhower's message brought further hope to the countries assembled that additional outlets might be found for the refugees and surplus population of Western Europe.

From the point of view of the United States, many reasons exist for enacting President Eisenhower's recommendations which have been implemented in the committee print. First, the United States will strengthen its foreign policy objectives through a program which reinforces the close bond existing between the people of the United States and the people of Western Europe. The admission of 240,000 healthy, ambitious workers and their families in the next 2 years to provide needed skills and manpower will at the same time make an important contribution to the American economy. But the objective in which the Mutual Security Agency is most directly interested, and which this committee print will help to further, is the building of increased economic and thus defensive strength for our Western European allies. I should like to address my remarks most specifically to this point.

United States foreign economic aid programs since World War II have been guided by the fact that Western Europe must be economically strong to remain politically secure. With the increasing emphasis on mutual security that has developed since the outbreak of the Korean war, the need for healthy economies is important on two further counts: First, to make it possible for Europe to build up an adequate defense program, and, secondly, to provide for gradually increasing living standards which will win and hold the loyalty of its citizens. To this end American economic aid, and later defense support, have made it possible for Western Europe to increase industrial production approximately 40 percent above prewar levels and agricultural production by 15 percent.

Despite an increase in population since the prewar period, employment levels have risen commensurately in most of the countries of Western Europe. Some surpluses are still concentrated, however, within a few countries, notably Italy, Western Germany, Greece, Austria, and the Netherlands.

The economic effects of that surplus are widespread and obvious. In the case of Italy, its overpopulation problem has been intensified by the backlog developed during the Mussolini regime when emigration was discouraged, by the postwar return of close to 500,000 Italians from its former colonies and other parts of the world. This increased pressure in a country already burdened with a large population relative to its few developed resources has heightened the pressures of unemployment and low per capita incomes.

Yet there are a few not widely known facts about the Italian situation which lend considerable encouragement to the future. The first, and most important, is that Italy's well-known overpopulation problem is by no means hopeless. Contrary to popular belief, the Italian birthrate has been declining markedly since the peak reached in 1872-75. Then it was 37 per 1,000; in 1952, it had declined to 17.6. If the present trend continues, which currently makes the Italian birthrate comparable to Western Europe and below that of the United States, the labor force is expected to become stabilized some 15 years hence.

The major solution to reducing Italy's overpopulation problem lies within the Italian economy itself. Migration can provide important supplementary relief in easing pressures immediately, but the most important long-range solution lies with an expanding economy in Italy. Here again, Italy has made notable progress since the end of World War II. It has been estimated that job increases and emigration have roughly offset increases in population. The backlog, however, still remains. Despite these encouraging facts, overpopulation still rates as Italy's No. 1 economic problem. The seriousness of it can best be illustrated by its effect on living standards. Per capita consumption in Italy for fiscal year 1951 averaged \$238 compared with an average of \$381 for all the countries included in the European Defense Community, and an average of \$1,359 for the United States. For Italy this was only slightly above 1938, but markedly improved over 1948.

Not only are wages low, but unemployment is high. In a recent survey of the labor force in Italy by the Tremelloni committee some interesting facts have come to light concerning the kinds of people who make up Italy's great reservoir of manpower. The greatest concentration is among the young, under 19 years of age—a group seeking their first job. Interestingly enough, the educational level is higher among the unemployed than the employed. This is especially true of the young people seeking their first job—close to 20 percent of whom are high-school or college graduates. Of those who formerly held industrial jobs, 1 out of every 3 had been unemployed for over a year.

These facts add up to serious economic poverty and a critical political situation. It explains, in part, why the Communists and parties allied to them received a higher percentage of votes in Italy than anywhere else in Western Europe. It explains, in part, the growing strength of the extreme right—the neo-Fascists, especially in the poverty stricken south where large scale underemployment prevails.

United States interest in a sound and politically stable Italian economy, therefore, requires support of programs designed to eliminate its hard core of surplus population. Major emphasis in United States economic aid has been placed on a more intensive economic development and expansion within Italy itself. As an important supplement to, but not a substitute for, increased economic development, migration has a significant economic as well as psychological contribution to make to Italy's overpopulation problem. The committee print, by permitting 75,000 physically fit and democratically oriented Italian migrants to start life anew in the United States, is in the best tradition of self-enlightened United States foreign policy. It points up United States concern with Italy's No. 1 problem; it provides useful manpower for the United States; at the same time puts us in a position of leadership to encourage other democratic countries to follow suit.

In Greece the pressures of population in relation to limited resources have resulted in even lower living standards. The effects of 5 years of fighting in World War II, followed by another 4 years of Communist guerrilla warfare, have created an internal refugee problem, necessitating resettlement for more than 750,000 of its own citizens. In addition some 40,000 others of Greek and non-Greek origin have sought refuge in Greece from behind the Iron Curtain. As in the case of Italy, the efforts of United States foreign economic aid programs have been to develop the industrial and agricultural capacity of Greece and create the financial stability necessary for an expanding economy. Although some success has been achieved, Greece still remains one of the poorest countries in Europe. Recorded unemployment is highest in the towns, but on the farms there is a chronic state of underemployment. Migration for some of these people will help to ease the burden at home and at the same time provide the United States with a new group of energetic useful workers and their families.

The Netherlands supports one of the highest population densities in the world. The loss of Indonesia and the economic dislocations caused by the war have made it difficult for the Netherlands to absorb its increasing population. With the exception of Western Germany, the Netherlands is the only country in Western Europe which has a lower per capita consumption today than existed before World War II. The Netherlands, therefore, still needs moderate increases in its rate of emigration to help ease its population pressures. The Dutch quota of 20,000 included in this committee print will provide an important assist in the right direction.

The remaining quotas assigned under this committee print are concerned with the refugee problem stemming from Communist pressures and policies. In the case of Western Germany and Austria, the refugee influx has added considerably to the economic burden of their population. The size of the influx is now well known. One out of every five within Germany is a refugee. As in the case of surplus-population countries, the most important solution to this overwhelming problem lies in the development of an expanding economy within Germany capable of absorbing the increases in the labor force. In this connection, the German record is phenomenal. Germany has experienced the largest expansion in employment in all of Western Europe, even though the level of unemployment has remained high.

This is, of course, due to the continuing influx of refugees from the East.

A few statistics, taken at random, will indicate the economic burden of the present refugee population within Western Germany. It is as though 30 million people—roughly the total population of Mexico and one-half of Canada—were to pour into the United States within a 6-year period seeking work and a place to live with no funds of their own. In Germany because the greater number of refugees have landed in rural areas which are less able to absorb them, they constitute almost one-third the number of unemployed although only one-fifth the population. Two-thirds of Germany's serious housing shortage is attributable to the refugee influx. In addition, more than 300,000 still remain in camps.

It has been estimated that 35 percent of the expellees have now been integrated into the German economy; another 45 percent have only partially been integrated; 20 percent still remain unsettled. The refugees, to focus attention on this condition, have tended to form political parties which only help to accentuate their differences with the native population. On the positive side, the escapee from communism has provided an invaluable source of manpower to rebuild Germany. As more housing becomes available to make possible a better distribution of the refugee worker in industrial areas, he will continue to provide necessary manpower to maintain the rapid rate of growth Germany has achieved within these past 3 years. Such integration, however, takes time. The size of the German problem, intensified by the tremendous flood of escapees from communism pouring through Berlin, still highlights the need for providing outlets now for those who need jobs, but can find no work opportunities within Western Germany. This is especially true for the non-German escapee within Germany and for the farmers who have fled from Communist-dominated areas to West Germany where land is lacking in sufficient quantities to provide them with a livelihood. To these and other refugees within Germany, this committee print extends an understanding hand and promise of a new opportunity.

The refugee in Austria, although not so numerous as in its neighboring country, is still an important factor within the Austrian economy. At the beginning of this year close to 250,000 refugees remained to be fully integrated within Austria. By far the largest proportion of these are ethnic Germans who recently have been granted working privileges equal to those held by Austrian citizens. A little under 50,000 are non-German speaking foreign refugees, more difficult to integrate. The cost of subsistence for the refugees, the lack of sufficient capital to employ them productively, the increased demands they occasion for scarce housing, and the political force they potentially represent have increased the problems of integration. The refugees, however, are potentially an important addition to the Austrian labor force because of their younger age and the predominance of farmworkers among them. Most of them, especially the Volkdeutsche, can probably be absorbed usefully within Austria, but the abnormal strains on the Austrian economy, produced by the divided control between the Soviet and Western powers, will delay any short-run solution. In the meantime, providing an outlet for some of these refugees and escapees will prove the United States interest in Austria's problem and our desire to instill hope in these people who have been the victims of outside political forces.

Of the various groups enumerated within the committee print, the final group is the escapee living in Western Europe, outside Germany and Austria. A quota of 15,000 has been proposed for these people, not primarily because they constitute an economic burden—although this is true to the extent to which they have fled to the very countries which already suffer from overpopulation—but rather because it behooves the United States to take special count of the brave men and women who at the risk of death to themselves and their families have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. To these people, the democratic free world owes an opportunity to experience freedom and a decent standard of living. This opportunity is lost in an overcrowded camp within the border countries. Such a reception fulfills little of the promise which has led men and women to escape. For purely humanitarian reasons, to fulfill an obligation which one should willingly wish to fulfill, this committee print offers these courageous men and women a new chance to live and enjoy freedom in our midst.

I have attempted, during these remarks, to limit myself largely to the economic aspects of overpopulation which has been of major concern in our foreign economic aid programs and which has helped motivate President Eisenhower to recommend the enactment of such emergency immigration legislation. Permit me in conclusion to say that even though the need for this committee print can be justified on economic grounds both in terms of our foreign and domestic policy, the greatest benefit to be reaped will be in the good will it will create amongst our working partners throughout Europe. Through this proposed legislation we will have demonstrated our willingness to open, not only our pocketbooks as we have done in the past, but our hearts to ease the burden of those who have suffered through no fault of their own and who, when given the chance, will make their contribution to the economic and political strength of the free world.

Let me close with a quote from President Eisenhower's message to Congressional leaders on this proposed legislation:

It is imperative that we join with the other nations in helping to find a solution to these grave questions. These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. . . . We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of a free world.

Mr. WALTER. (In the chair). Thank you, Mrs. Houghton.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may talk for 5 minutes, does that meet with the permission of the committee?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, indeed.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. So much of my statement was covered yesterday by General Smith, Acting Secretary of State, in the question and answer period that I can very briefly summarize my statement.

Last month I attended the meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland, where I heard President Eisenhower's letter to Hugh Gibson, director general of this committee, read. Immediately it gave a ray of hope and light to the delegates of the 22 member governments represented there.

Six days following the reading of this letter, which was so encouraging to all the members, came the report of the President's request for legislation to allow 240,000 European migrants into our country in 2 years' time. Might I say that this gave added hope and a new glow



to the conference and the feeling that new outlets might now be found for those who needed to emigrate from the overpopulated areas of western Europe. Very naturally, the MSA is tremendously interested in this committee print because we are concerned with the kind of assistance that will bring increased defense effort and also we are interested in raising the living standards of all countries in NATO and in western Europe.

So for that reason we look to this committee print with a great deal of interest and hope that it will pass.

Italy has a tremendous surplus population which has been due, as has been already said, to the lack of emigration during Mussolini's regime when it was so discouraged; to 500,000 of their own people that returned from former colonies and to 25,000 escapees in Italy today. Italy has done a wonderful job in economic recovery because it has kept up with the current increase in its labor force through greater job opportunities and emigration. But there is a backlog, a tremendous backlog in Italy that needs to be cut down. For that reason it is felt, while Italy has done a wonderful job of recovery domestically, the 75,000 that are expected to leave Italy and come to our country under the provisions of this committee print will provide substantial relief.

A peculiar situation exists in Italy where the greatest percentage of the unemployed is concentrated among the young people, about 19 years of age.

Interestingly enough, the educational level of the unemployed is higher than the employed, especially in the case of the young people, 20 percent of whom are high school and college graduates. So it is these young people who are looking for jobs, who want to get married that are most seriously hampered by this backlog.

Therefore, we are looking forward to helping Italy through such legislation as the committee print provides. We think the time is especially appropriate both for economic and political reasons.

We look at Greece and realize that they are very overcrowded, one of the poorest countries in all of Europe—next to Turkey and Portugal, the poorest country. They had 750,000 of their own people they had to resettle after the guerrilla war ended. Besides that, many escapees from behind the Iron Curtain have come into their country. Greece is really in need of help. We feel that providing for 25,000 immigrants from Greece will be a great help to them in finding additional emigration outlets and in assisting the economy of their own country.

We move on to the Netherlands. They have the highest birthrate and are the most densely populated country in western Europe. Therefore, we want to help the Dutch. They are good farmers and they need to have additional outlets for their population surplus. We are very sympathetic with the Dutch. They are among our best friends and we hope that the 20,000 special quota visas which the committee print provides will be granted.

The density of population in Austria and Germany is affected by the refugee problem which is so interesting to you, Mr. Walter, and to me as head of the Office of Refugees and Migration in the Mutual Security Agency. I was in Germany, as many of you in the committee have been, but I was there last month at a time when 1,400 to 1,500 refugees came through Berlin in one day. You know it went over four thousand in one day and in March over 48,000 crossed the border from the eastern zone to the western zone.

The Federal Republic has done remarkable work integrating the refugees. In fact, they spent over 6 billion deutschemarks themselves in immediate aid to refugees within the Federal Republic. But now something must be done to help the refugees who have not yet been investigated in Western Germany.

Mr. WALTER. How many of those people would come to the United States—would want to come?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Of course, I think there are probably more that want to come than we realize. I know that the Federal Republic is seeking immediate emigration for 30,000 to 50,000 non-German escapees and there are, in addition, 1,125,000 farm workers who cannot be readily absorbed.

Mr. WALTER. What is the status of the German quota?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. 110,000 special quota visas are provided in the committee print for refugees in Germany and Austria.

Mr. WALTER. What is the status of the quota actually? Is it current? There is no pressure on the quota of Germany; it is current.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. The expellees are not eligible under the current quota.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, if they were born in Germany, they come under the German quota. Ever since March 27, last, when the Bundestag integrated 10 million expellees and 2 million Soviet-zone refugees, there hasn't been this desire to move. These people want to stay in Germany.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I will turn this over and let my economic expert answer you because she is so well informed. Would you please allow Miss Finger to answer you on the economic question?

Mr. WALTER. As soon as you complete your statement; go ahead.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. There are 8 million refugees in Western Germany that would not qualify under the present quota because they were the expellees, born outside of Germany, but Miss Finger will develop that further on.

We should help to alleviate the dreadful crowded conditions that have been intensified by the recent flood of refugees passing from the eastern to the western zone. There are still 350,000 people in the camps of Germany. I visited these camps as I know many of you did. I went to a reception center in Berlin and saw these people coming through. It is the sympathy in our hearts for what we can do for that dreadful situation that the quota of 110,000 is so high in the committee print.

In Austria there is a serious situation due to Austria being divided between east and west. It is very hard to integrate all of the refugees in Austria.

Then there are the 15,000 escapees scattered through NATO countries. We feel that some of them should have an opportunity to be brought into our country. America will then prove not only has she a pocketbook that has been opened very wide but she also has a heart that is expressed in this bill.

We are interested in the overpopulated countries of Italy, Greece, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria. We feel that this contemplated legislation will be a tremendous help. MSA with its interest in economic recovery pays tribute to countries for what they have done for themselves. But due to outside conditions and the great

influx of escapees and expellees, we feel that this committee print is well worth our support, Mr. Chairman.

Miss THOMPSON. Mrs. Houghton, as I understand it, you think the special quota of 75,000 Italians would not make any dent at all on this surplus population problem?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I do think, Judge Thompson, it would make a dent. People spoke several times yesterday about it being merely a gesture. I think it is much more than a gesture of good will because while we have talked about the birth rate of Italy declining, and it has from its peak of 37 per thousand to only 17.6 per thousand, yet there is a backlog of labor surplus that must be reduced. If this trend continues the labor force of Italy will be stabilized in 15 years. But the backlog is all-important in Italy, resulting, as I have said, from the damming up of emigration under Mussolini, the half million people who have come back from its former colonies and the 25,000 escapees. Today this surplus is not only an economic problem but it is also a political problem. We must help provide migration outlets because Italy cannot absorb all of its newcomers with the labor market due to the backlog. Special quotas for 75,000 can become a sparkplug for increased Italian emigration throughout the world.

Miss THOMPSON. You did say the Italian surplus problem can be solved in the long run.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. That is right, but I think today is all-important.

Miss THOMPSON. Why should we concern ourselves about it at this present time?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Because Italy's labor surplus today constitutes a serious economic and political problem. I think the political angle should be emphasized, especially with their elections so near.

Mr. HILLINGS. Well, Mrs. Houghton, in your prepared statement which you submitted to the committee, you say that already Australia, Canada, and some Latin American countries have announced ambitious plans to admit European migrants to their shores during the coming year. Well, you really think that they are going to follow through on some of those plans or how strongly do you feel about some of the other countries carrying their share of the load?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. After attending the conference in Geneva, I feel very strongly about their intentions to promote as much European emigration as possible. Of course, you realize, that Australia has done a tremendous job. They apologized last year for falling down some in the number they took in due to domestic economic conditions, but they hope to get back to their 150,000. In 1953 and 1954 Canada likewise hopes to get back to its 200,000. There were four South American countries that had very ambitious colonization programs. Among them was Brazil. The South American countries have taken, as you know, Italians in great numbers in the past. Brazil wanted Italian migrants to bring with them, if possible, their farming equipment and tools and also industrial equipment to set up such industries as meat packing and flour plants in the rural districts. They seem to be very honest in their intent and we had every feeling of their desire to go through with it.

As was said yesterday, Argentine reports that she has taken in 600,000 migrants from Europe during the last 5 years. Chile is promising to take in 600 Dutch families. They approve of moving the family unit as a whole, as all of us do. Venezuela was also making

an offer to take in 50 families immediately and up to 500 families very soon.

To answer your question directly, I have a feeling that these recipient countries are very much in earnest and even more than that, when America passes, if she does, an emergency bill, I feel that other nations will come forward with even more ambitious plans, as they did under the IRO.

Mr. HILLINGS. You know the other day, Mrs. Houghton, the President delivered a very important speech on foreign policy at the National Press Club. The theme of the speech was that we could have peace in the world if the Communists would show us their good intentions by deeds rather than words.

Now, I do not want to compare some of these other countries because they are our allies and they are good friends of ours, at least we like to think so. But I think that if we are going to convince the Congress of the United States that legislation of this kind is important, it is going to be necessary to take the President's theme, deeds not words, to show that some of the other countries are carrying the load. That points up this question. You are the assistant director for refugees and migration and Harold Stassen is the head of the agency. Have you done very much in that position or has your office done very much to encourage and give some leadership to these other countries to take some more positive action than they have instead of just offering a bunch of promises and ambitious plans toward taking in some of these people?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. May I say, Mr. Hillings, I have been in my office only 5 weeks—I am very new. I will say that it is our intent by all means to take the leadership in this—especially if this committee print goes through.

Mr. HILLINGS. It seems to me that that is terribly important. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Walter, indicated yesterday, part of this problem or perhaps the great part of this whole problem could be solved if some of the leaders in this country would have a little more courage in providing leadership to some of these other countries to take on their share of the load. I am convinced that Australia and many of the other countries that you have mentioned could do a lot more than they are doing at the present time and if we send our people to meetings at Geneva, places like that, and we applaud very sweetly when they announce that they have ambitious plans, that is not going to be sufficient; and this bill, with that type of attitude on the part of some of our leaders, is not going to solve this problem by any means.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Hillings. I am sure our office will provide the leadership.

Mr. HILLINGS. Let me ask you this. Would you favor legislation to bring in 500,000 people instead of 240,000 if that legislation should be offered at this time in the Congress?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. No, I do not think I would. I think these quotas have been carefully determined by experts. I feel that this quota of 240,000 in 2 years has been estimated so as to provide relief in the surplus population countries and also to be a number that can be absorbed within our country.

Mr. HILLINGS. Let me ask you one other question. I notice in another part of your prepared statement you said that admission of

240,000 healthy, ambitious workers and their families in the next 2 years to provide needed skills and manpower will at the same time make an important contribution to the American economy.

Now, is that not somewhat idealistic and not based on the facts and experience of previous bills of this kind in that we did not get the skilled workers. We got for the most part unskilled workers. Is it not also true to carry the question a little further that the people coming in under this legislation would for the most part be unskilled workers who could not contribute greatly to skilled manpower in this country?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. All I can say, Mr. Hillings, is that it is up to the United States of America to determine whom we will receive. After all, these people are carefully screened with regard to health and security. Further, you remember, that this committee print provides for assurances that these people will not displace Americans from jobs or housing. They can also be selected for the kind of jobs on the farms and in industry that we need. They can be skilled workers, if that is what we want.

Mr. HILLINGS. Would we have your assurance that insofar as your connection with this program is concerned, assuming the Congress should act favorably upon it, that it would be your desire to take steps to encourage the bringing in of such skilled workers?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I think that farmers should be included along with skilled workers. I come from Iowa, a rural State, and I know that farmers are very badly needed in different parts of America. Shouldn't they be classified as skilled workers?

Mr. HILLINGS. If they are, unfortunately our previous experience was that we had industrial workers who said they were farmers.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. That is up to us in all the screening that is done, both there and here.

Mr. HILLINGS. Do you think the screening process could do it?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I do, Mr. Hillings.

Mr. HILLINGS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. Are you acquainted with the final report of the Displaced Persons Commission?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I have a copy on my desk, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. That is not the question.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I cannot say I am well acquainted with it as yet.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, the Commission in its report found that these people who have been carefully screened, selected, semiskilled type, particularly did not remain where they were settled.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. I think that careful screening would help.

In any case in this country we have always had labor mobility, people moving to better jobs.

Mr. WALTER. Of course that is the fact. But the movement is greater with these people because they seek out their own language groups and go into communities where there is already a housing shortage and aggravate that situation. When they are originally settled they are settled somewhere where they do not deprive somebody of housing or a job. But under our laws there is nothing to keep them there and they immediately go to some place where there is a situation that is critical.

You say that this figure of 240,000 was carefully arrived at. Will you tell us how you arrived at the figure of 20,000 with respect to the Netherlands as opposed to 25,000 in Judge Thompson's bill?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Mr. Morse attended those interdepartmental meetings. Will you answer that question, Mr. Morse?

Mr. MORSE. First an overall figure of 240,000 was determined. It was that figure which was thought——

Mr. WALTER. How did you arrive at the 240,000?

Mr. MORSE. We did not crank an adding machine; that would not be giving you a correct picture.

Mr. WALTER. I do know that this print was modeled after a bill which was introduced in the last Congress, at the request of President Truman. The figures were guessed at, just arbitrarily fixed. I know that. And I am thoroughly convinced that the same thing applies to this 240,000. Somebody guessed that. And then having arrived at a figure to be used over a period of 2 years, then of course it was broken down.

Is that not the fact?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that you could say that it was guesswork that resulted in the 240,000 figure. I think there were a lot of different factors which went into it. As I said before, you cannot be mathematically precise.

Mr. WALTER. Actually, 70,000 is not significant at all with respect to the Italian situation, is it?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is significant from the standpoint of what the bill is trying to accomplish and that is a mixture of many things. As I said, I don't think a computing machine could be used to arrive at those figures. We were trying to accomplish both economic and political objectives in Italy.

Mr. WALTER. You have apparently lost sight of the fact that Australia took 700,000 aliens in 4½ years.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. They were not Italians. That was the total immigration, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. It was their entire immigration. What did they express at this meeting in Geneva as their targets for this year?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. The target of ICEM for 1953 is 120,000 to be moved with a budget of \$36 million.

Mr. WALTER. No, no; to Australia.

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Excuse me. I thought you meant for the entirety. 31,200 are expected to be moved by ICEM to Australia in 1954.

Mr. WALTER. Total or Italian?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Total—from Europe. That, of course, is only the number ICEM will move. Total Australian immigration will be much higher.

Mr. WALTER. If this problem is political, why is it that just a few nations where there is a surplus population problem were considered? Why was not the problem as it exists all over the world taken into consideration?

Mr. MORSE. I think it was, and I think this bill——

Mr. WALTER. If that is the fact, then what consideration was given to the problem as it exists in Java, for example?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell you this, sir, that this bill was attempting to accomplish something which was thought could be accomplished,

something which we thought the United States could usefully do. The executive department as a whole is trying to work on those other problems through other appropriate means.

Mr. WALTER. Well, if it is a problem of surplus population, I take Java because the situation there is very critical; there are 47,446,000 people in Java in territory consisting of 50,745 square miles.

Mr. MORSE. That is right. There are aid programs now going on in southeast Asia which are trying to develop those areas.

Mr. WALTER. Why was not Java included in this bill?

Mr. MORSE. Because we did not think that the solution to their problem would be immigration into this country.

Mr. WALTER. What effect will the enactment of this legislation, if it is enacted, have on the interest other nations have displayed in the operation of that organization whose meeting you attended in Geneva?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. For the other nations attending the meeting, the possibility of enacting U. S. legislation was considered very encouraging.

Miss THOMPSON. For the benefit of those who are present as guests in this committee today, and because my bill was referred to in connection with this discussion, I would like to say that I introduced the bill for admitting 25,000 Dutch refugees into this country because of the flood disaster, and I would like to say to you that every one of those 25,000 refugees has a sponsor in the United States, so that it will not cost our country one dime for those people. The Dutch ministers throughout the United States have organized and have secured, as I said before, sponsors for 25,000 of those refugees.

Now I would like to ask Mrs. Houghton another question. As I understand it, the MSA is asking for a \$10 million appropriation for this Geneva organization, is that right?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Yes, for the financing of the transportation of European immigrants from surplus-population countries.

Miss THOMPSON. Then I would like to ask, what is the total budget of that organization?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. The total budget is \$36 million for the movement of 120,000 in 1953, and for 1954 it is \$40.4 million to move 140,000 emigrants.

Miss THOMPSON. Then we are paying one third of the total amount?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. One third.

Miss THOMPSON. This is the second appropriation?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. This is the third appropriation. The first appropriation was \$10 million; the second appropriation was \$9 million-plus; the third appropriation asked for is \$10 million. In 1951, the U. S. appropriated \$10 million; in 1952, \$9,240,000, as I said; and this year we are asking for \$10 million.

Miss THOMPSON. The total budget for ICEM is \$36 million?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. That is right.

Miss THOMPSON. And we pay more than a third?

Mrs. HOUGHTON. Less than a third.

Mr. WALTER. Are there any other witnesses? The meeting will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a. m.)





# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to notice, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Hon. Louis E. Graham (chairman) presiding.

Present: Mr. Graham, Miss Thompson, Mr. Hillings, Mr. Celler, and Mr. Walter.

Also present: Mr. Walter M. Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee will please come to order.

I would like to make a brief announcement. We will close promptly at 11:45 for the reason that there is a very important bill on the floor dealing with the crime situation in the District of Columbia. Tomorrow we will continue with our work.

Before calling the first witness, I have here a letter dated May 15, 1953, from the National Alliance of Czech Catholics, Chicago, Ill. The letter, addressed to me, says:

On behalf of the membership of the National Alliance of Czech Catholics, which membership extends into your State, we appeal to you to give your support to the passage of emergency legislation permitting admission of from 200,000 to 300,000 displaced persons who are now residing in DP camps in Europe and elsewhere.

Such legislation was recommended recently by President Eisenhower in order to offer these homeless and suffering people a sanctuary in which they might begin anew an orderly mode of life.

Thanking you for your kind consideration of this matter and with best wishes, we are—

and the letter is signed by the Reverend Martin A. Krizka, chaplain, and John W. Voller, president.

This is a resolution to support the Watkins immigration bill, also known as Senate bill 1917, from the Columbus Alliance, Inc., Bronx, N. Y.:

Whereas the Watkins immigration bill was introduced pursuant to the recommendations of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which will permit 240,000 immigrants to enter into the United States of America; and

Whereas at the regular meeting held on May 20, 1953, the members of the Columbus Alliance unanimously adopted a resolution to support the said Watkins immigration bill: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the members of the Columbus Alliance,* That our representatives in Congress be importuned to work unceasingly toward the passage of the Watkins immigration bill, also known as Senate bill 1917; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our representatives in Congress.

That bears the signature of Richard A. Dee, president. I further have a telegram addressed to Chairman Reed:

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 9, 1953.

Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
House Committee on the Judiciary,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The national board of the Young Women's Christian Association wholeheartedly supports emergency legislation for special admission of fair share of refugees, expellees, and escapees from Europe to this country at the earliest possible date. Agreeing with President Eisenhower that in the best American tradition this country should become a haven for helpless people.

Mrs. EDWARD W. MACY, *President.*

Mr. GRAHAM. I have here on the letterhead of the United Service for New Americans, Inc., New York, under date of June 5, 1953, a note over the signature of Arthur Greenleigh, with which is a statement setting forth the views of various organizations listed in the statement.

The statement says:

The organizations in whose behalf this statement is submitted are as follows:

- American Jewish Committee.
- Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.
- Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society.
- Jewish Labor Committee.
- Jewish War Veterans.
- National Council of Jewish Women.

United Service for New Americans (which operates overseas through the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee).

The National Council of Jewish Women, Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society and United Service for New Americans deal directly with the immigrant and have a continuous history in the field of immigration and resettlement of nearly 70 years. During that time they have aided many thousands of newcomers through a network of local affiliates by providing a program of planned settlement and integration services. The interest of the other organizations is of a more general character. They are agencies engaged in programs to foster intergroup amity in pursuance of the principle that all men are to be dealt with justly and equally.

All the signatory organizations, on the basis of their experience in working with the immigrant, can attest to the success of his integration into and his contribution to American life. All these agencies consider it a matter of prime importance that the immigration legislation of the United States should be humane in all its aspects and should embody the heritage of freedom and equality of opportunity which has made America great.

The number of our coreligionists overseas who can benefit from emergency legislation is comparatively small. The agencies making this presentation have a humanitarian concern for the welfare of all displaced and unsettled persons and for the many persons in Greece, Italy, and Holland who, because of the difficult conditions resulting from World War II, must emigrate. We feel that immigration legislation which meets these needs will benefit not only the persons aided but, also, the United States in its domestic affairs and its foreign policy. We recognize that even the admission of 240,000 persons in 2 years will not fully solve the problem of the refugee, the displaced, and the unsettled. However, this action has great significance for the world as a demonstration of the interest and responsibility of the United States and as a stimulus to other receiving countries which look to the United States for leadership in the solution of such problems. We believe that it will hearten the displaced and unsettled persons including those who have risked their lives fleeing from Communist terror to seek refuge in the western democracies.

As agencies interested in migration and resettlement we have given considerable thought to the basic immigration policy of the United States. We feel strongly that it is essential in order to meet emergency problems such as this and others which might arise in the future, that the United States immigration law be revised to eliminate the national origins quota system and to increase the number of persons to be admitted annually. The Immigration and Nationality Act passed last year is inflexible and, therefore, incapable of meeting emergency problems such as face us now.

We welcome the interest shown by the President of the United States in proposing emergency legislation and recommending a study leading to revision of the basic immigration law. Since the revision of the immigration law is still under study and because there are these emergency needs and because of our concern for the people involved and also because of the requirements of our foreign policy, we think it is important to have emergency legislation to permit at least 240,000 persons to enter the United States within the next 2 years.

We also commend those Congressmen who have introduced various bills which in great part take cognizance of the needs that exist at this time and which are inspired by humanitarian considerations. We would like to call particular attention to several urgent problems and principles which we believe should be contained in any bill.

(1) European refugees stranded in China and Manchuria who face extermination unless some provision is made for their admission. We think at least 5,000 visas should be available for them.

(2) Refugees and displaced persons temporarily in the United States who are unable to return to their countries of origin and who have no form of relief under the present law. We urge that at least 2,000 visas be made available to this group for the purpose of adjusting their status.

(3) In addition to provision for those escapees in other European countries. Many of the bills proposed use the term "firm resettlement" as a criterion in limiting eligibility. Experience has shown that the term "firm resettlement" is vague, indefinite, and difficult to administer. We would suggest that the term be changed to read "persons who have not been permanently resettled with members of their immediate family" or "persons who are not nationals of the country in which they reside."

(4) Some of the bills make provision for persons in Greece, Italy, and Holland. However, in describing the persons to be covered, it would be desirable to avoid the use of the term "ethnic." This word has no scientific meaning, is not truly descriptive, and has implications which are not consistent with American ideals. We recommend the use of such phraseology as "nationals, returnees from the possessions, and residents generally."

(5) We are in favor of giving priority to the reunion of family members. This is consistent with the humanitarian purposes of such legislation and with the tradition of the United States.

(6) We believe that any proposed priority for persons with occupational skills is inconsistent with American tradition and dilutes the humanitarian basis of this bill.

We are concerned also by the inclusion of a provision which ties the immigrant to a specific job. It has implications of peonage which are abhorrent to American thinking and ideals.

(7) We believe that any such legislation should contain an express prohibition against discrimination based on race, religion, or national origin in the selection of immigrants within the various categories. We also believe that any such legislation should contain a provision excluding from admission any person who advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin. We note that several of the bills under consideration contain such provisions.

We hope that consideration will be given to these suggestions in order that a measure which has great possibilities for alleviation of human misery may be so framed as to achieve the greatest possible good in this humanitarian effort.

#### STATEMENT OF A. R. MACKEY, COMMISSIONER, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY L. PAUL WININGS, GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. GRAHAM. Our first witness this morning will be Mr. Mackey, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Come forward, please, sir.

Mr. MACKEY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. William Rogers, the Deputy Attorney General, is unavoidably detained this morning. He asked me to announce it to the committee.

I have a statement, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to read to the committee if I may, sir.

It is my privilege to appear before you today as the representative of the Department of Justice in support of President Eisenhower's emergency immigration program. The bill now being considered by this committee spells out the legislative authority for that program. The President has called to the attention of the Congress the plight of the many thousands of refugees, escapees, and homeless unfortunates in Europe. He has pointed to the excessive burdens imposed on the free nations of Europe in attempting to deal with this constantly increasing army of uprooted human beings and in seeking to solve problems of overpopulation resulting in large measure from World War II. He has urged the enactment of legislation, within the framework of the immigration laws, to admit to the United States 240,000 additional immigrants during the next 2 years. I hope, therefore, that this bill will speedily be translated into law.

During our generation the American people have been thrust into a position of leadership among the free peoples of the world. We have become increasingly alert to the responsibilities which go with leadership and power. Most of us have come to realize that the interests of the United States cannot be measured solely by occurrences within our national boundaries, and that conditions in countries beyond the seas may have a direct bearing on the security and welfare of our Nation. We have responded magnificently in the past to many calls for assistance. And I am confident that we will not turn our backs on needs which prompt the present proposals.

One byproduct of the upheavals in our disturbed era has been the spectacle of vast numbers of distressed human beings who have been uprooted and destituted by the ideological and military conflicts of our time. In the wake of the fighting in World War II hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons remained under the shelter of the victorious Allies. The care and resettlement of these homeless unfortunates was a problem that had to be solved. And the people of the United States met this challenge. In concert with the other free nations we organized the International Refugee Organization and participated actively in its operations. As a direct contribution to the solution of this problem we opened our gates to 400,000 displaced persons who were welcomed by the people of the United States over a 4-year period. Both of these enterprises are now successfully concluded. It is my conviction that these are bright chapters in our Nation's history.

The legislation you are considering addresses somewhat different problems. To some extent these difficulties may be attributed to dislocations resulting from World War II. In larger measure, however, they have emerged from the postwar advance of the Communist terror. These obviously are areas in which the United States has a vital concern.

One of the most urgent problems with which the President's emergency program copes is that of the so-called escapees. In the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain there are millions of men and women who hate the totalitarian oppressors. Some of them only recently have awakened to the bitter realities of life in a slave state. Others have always rejected the false doctrines but have been silenced by superior force. It is important for us to keep alive the flame of hope in the hearts of our friends behind the Iron Curtain.

The misery and oppression of life under communism have given rise to a moment of escape. Thousands have fled and are fleeing across the frontier into the free world. They have risked their lives in evading the border guards and have abandoned their homes, their possessions, and their friends. These determined pilgrims have experienced at first hand the Communist way of life and want no more of it. In this epic flight to the west the escapees have sought to find the freedom denied them under communism.

The people of the free world have encouraged and welcomed these defections. But the burden has fallen most heavily on those of our friends who are least able to shoulder it. The free nations adjacent to the Iron Curtain have been struggling to solve their own problems of overpopulation and to establish their economies on a solid, self-supporting basis. They can hardly be expected to assume this added load of responsibility. This is a matter that must be dealt with by all the free nations, working together.

The second major area of difficulty with which the President's emergency program deals is that of excess populations in some of the countries of Europe. This problem most acutely affects several important members of the European community. Thus, our friends in Italy face an unbalanced population pattern attributable in large measure to the consequences of World War II. I am informed that over 600,000 ethnic Italians have come to Italy from the colonies and other areas lost by Italy in the war. These have descended upon a population structure that already was quite delicately balanced and have had a disturbing effect on the reviving Italian economy.

A similar situation prevails in the Netherlands, which likewise has been deprived of large colonial possessions. The denial of opportunity to emigrate, coupled with the repatriation of many thousands of Dutch nationals in the colonies, has visited upon the Dutch a burden of population their small country cannot absorb. This condition in the Netherlands has been aggravated by the recent catastrophic floods.

Another phase of the overpopulation picture in Europe is found in Greece, which is still suffering from the devastation visited upon it during World War II and during the Soviet-inspired civil strife that followed it. With characteristic heroism, the Greek people are striving to conquer adversity, but they are still plagued by the dislocations of war. To our friends in Greece the excess of population over the country's present resources is a source of potential danger which can be removed only if opportunities for emigration are made available.

The final major aspect of the President's emergency program, which obviously is likewise a phase of overpopulation stringencies, relates to the expellees. These are the millions of persons of German ethnic origin who were ejected from the areas conquered by the Soviet armies during World War II. They were dumped upon the war-shattered economy of Western Germany, which has been incapable of assimilating and providing for them.

The escapees, expellees, and excess populations manifestly have created serious problems. Much thought and energy already has been devoted to these problems, and the United States has contributed substantially to the funds and the organizations which have been provided by the joint effort of many nations. But the distressed human beings with whom these programs have dealt need more than

a dole, more than the drab existence of a camp. They want and need the opportunity to rebuild useful, productive lives, to sink their roots into a free soil. So long as these destitute people are denied the chance to live in dignity and in a normal pattern of life they represent a potentially explosive force in the lands of our European allies. Their dilemma can be resolved only by opening avenues for migration, which alone can provide a safety valve against the current pressures of dislocated populations in Europe.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that the United States cannot and should not itself attempt to resolve the population problems of the world, or even of Europe. Joint action, in which every nation participates, obviously is demanded. But it is clear that the modest dimensions of the President's emergency program do not purport to embark the United States on a single handed program of coping with these vast dislocations. All that the President's program seeks is the reception by the United States of only 240,000 additional immigrants during a 2-year period, 110,000 from Western Germany, 15,000 from other European members of NATO, 75,000 from Italy, 20,000 from Greece, and 20,000 from the Netherlands. This is a moderate total, but the approval of these formulas will demonstrate to the people of the world that the United States again is willing to assume a position of leadership in extending aid to those who yearn for freedom and enlarged opportunities. And experience has demonstrated that the assumption of such initiative by the United States has encouraged and hastened similar action by other nations. Action by the United States is an important and necessary first step in dealing with the immediate emergency, and like action by other nations assuredly will follow.

By adopting the President's emergency program the United States will once again respond generously to a plea to aid the dispossessed. Such a program is doubtless in keeping with the finest American traditions. But it is well to keep in mind that there is more to the President's emergency program than an appeal for humanitarian aid to our friends in Europe. That doubtless is an important objective. But an equally important aim is to further the interests of the United States and to achieve a number of direct benefits to our Nation.

In the first place, the opportunities for migration made possible by the President's emergency program will be a beacon of hope to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, encouraging them to escape from bondage by offering a chance to live decent, useful lives in the world of freedom. It is undeniably in our interest to encourage such defections and to demonstrate to all peoples the emptiness and brutality of life behind the Iron Curtain. We applaud these escapees today but have nothing to offer them except access to the blind alley of existence without opportunity. Faced with such a prospect of frustration the bright expectations eventually will fade and the stream of flight will dry up. It is important for the free world to keep alive the dream of freedom by demonstrating inaction that the escapee can achieve a better life.

Secondly, it is of the utmost importance that the crushing burdens imposed by the escapees, the expellees, and the excess populations be removed from the backs of our friends in Europe who are not equipped to carry the load. This difficulty probably has been most acute in Italy, Western Germany, Greece, and the Netherlands,

which are vital in the joint effort to oppose the Communist menace in Europe. It has been a major aim of the policy of the United States to aid in rebuilding the economies of these nations as bulwarks against Communist aggression. It is obviously in our national interest to lift this excessive load which has fallen on these countries and which tends to defeat our efforts to assist them in attaining maximum economic health. By making this comparatively small effort we shall contribute substantially to the solution of a problem that must be solved. We shall be exerting our efforts in furthering our national interests. And we shall be eliminating potential explosive spots, generated by thousands of homeless and hopeless human beings, that menace the security and stability of our friends in free Europe.

Moreover, it seems to me that America can profit from the reception of these new immigrants. Other witnesses who possess more specialized knowledge doubtless will discuss with you the economic needs and absorptive capacity of the United States. My information is that expert opinion is virtually unanimous in agreeing that the America of today easily can absorb 240,000 new immigrants over a 2-year period. Only last year the United States concluded operations under the displaced persons program which brought 400,000 additional immigrants to the United States over a 4-year span. I am not aware that the reception of these new settlers has had any adverse effects upon the economy or welfare of our Nation. Indeed, the reports that have reached me indicate that the displaced persons are becoming fully integrated into our communities and are making significant contributions to our national life and culture.

It is my belief that our country will be enriched by the skills, the knowledge, and the energy of the immigrants who will come to our shores under the President's emergency program. And it is important to bear in mind that in many instances these are people who have seen the Communist despotism in action, and can testify personally to the emptiness of its false promises. The experience and the information they bring to us can be invaluable in combating the evil of communism. And their zeal in supporting the democratic way of life certainly makes them desirable additions to our society.

It is natural that a program of this character should entail some element of risk. The fact that so many of these prospective immigrants recently have come from behind the Iron Curtain counsels us to proceed cautiously. The Department of Justice is charged with responsibility for administering the immigration laws and for safeguarding the internal security of the United States. The Department of Justice is mindful of the care that must be exercised in administering this program so that the safety and welfare of the United States will not be jeopardized. But you can be assured that all possible vigilance will be exercised to protect the security of the United States while executing the important objectives of the President's emergency program.

The measure you are considering contains ample safeguards, in my opinion, against the admittance of those who are undesirable, unworthy, or dangerous. In the first place, it directs in section 3 that each applicant for entry must qualify for admission under the standards prescribed by the Immigration and Naturalization Act and thus invokes the comprehensive protections of that statute. Moreover, section 10 requires that a thorough investigation be conducted

regarding the character, history, and eligibility of each applicant for the benefits of the statute. The required investigation will assemble all available intelligence and security data and will minimize any risks. It seems to me that with sound and alert administration the procedures envisaged by this legislation fully protect the interests of the United States. This, in my judgment, is a factor of the highest importance in your appraisal of the proposals now before you.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I completely and wholeheartedly support President Eisenhower's emergency immigration program. We in the Department of Justice are prepared to do its share in assuring its success. It seems to me that the adoption of this program is of vital importance to ourselves as well as to every participant in the great effort to maintain freedom. Its rejection would be a tragic misfortune. It cannot fail without withering the hopes of those who repose in us their trust for leadership in this hour of history.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Walter, do you wish to interrogate the witness?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. MACKEY, you have stated that in your judgment the safeguards to our security are ample.

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. How could we possibly check on these people who have been living behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MACKEY. It would be a very difficult task, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. It would be impossible, would it not?

Mr. MACKEY. Practically impossible.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think the safeguards as spelled out in the bill are ample to protect the United States?

Mr. MACKEY. It is proposed, Mr. Congressman, to have pre-examination and investigation of each applicant before they apply for an emigration visa. There will be such a volume to choose from that we will be able to reject anyone where we have the slightest doubt as to his loyalty.

Mr. WALTER. How many aliens are there in the United States illegally as of now?

Mr. MACKEY. That I would not know, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Somebody in your shop estimated that it is between four and five million; is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. How many aliens were deported from California alone last year?

Mr. MACKEY. Last year, in the neighborhood of a million, Mr. Congressman; I do not have the figures with me. However, most of those were Mexican agricultural laborers, as you know.

Mr. WALTER. How many aliens are now illegally in the metropolitan area of New York?

Mr. MACKEY. That would be impossible to estimate, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know how impossible it is. Several years ago, an investigation of that situation was made by a subcommittee of this committee, a subcommittee consisting of the present Governor of the State of Delaware and of former Congressman Gossett. They came back with a report that there were over 500,000 people illegally in the New York area.



Mr. MACKEY. I do not know how they could have ascertained that, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. I think they got it from your office in New York, largely.

Mr. MACKEY. I investigated that and it seems that one of our men was asked how many illegal aliens were in the city of New York, and he stated that he did not know; and someone said, "Well, would you say 200,000?" He said, "Could be, more or less."

Mr. WALTER. That is why these two very responsible Members of Congress came back and reported there were 500,000 because somebody said there may be 200,000 more or less?

Mr. MACKEY. This is the first time I had heard the figure, Mr. Congressman, of 500,000.

Mr. WALTER. In the event that this legislation is enacted, or similar legislation, you feel that it will point the way for joint efforts by other nations to engage in an attempt to work out a solution to this problem?

Mr. MACKEY. I think it would encourage them.

Mr. WALTER. What more encouragement do they need than what we have already given through the establishment of the international organization to move migrants?

Mr. MACKEY. That is an area, Mr. Congressman, that I prefer someone else to testify to.

Mr. WALTER. You say that this is the sort of a thing that requires joint effort.

Mr. MACKEY. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. We are already engaged in that sort of an effort.

Mr. MACKEY. All I know is what has been told me. I have been informed that it would encourage others to participate in the program and to cooperate.

Mr. WALTER. That is the reason why you think we should enact this law?

Mr. MACKEY. There are many other reasons.

Mr. WALTER. Lead the way. Among other things, you said, in speaking of the direct benefits to the United States, we would encourage people to escape from behind the Iron Curtain. I think you said that was the principal reason.

Mr. MACKEY. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. If all of the people opposed to Communism escaped, as you put it, where would the hard core of resistance come from after they left their places of abode?

Mr. MACKEY. Mr. Congressman, may I ask my General Counsel to answer that question?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. WININGS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is a question where policy has to turn one way or the other. The fact that present history fails to disclose that there are peoples who are seeking to flee from the so-called free countries of the world that the flight comes from the Iron Curtain countries as we call them, it is a part of a program, as I understand it, to encourage this as a worldwide dramatization of the nature of the government of the Iron Curtain countries as opposed to the nature of the government of the free countries of the world—

Mr. WALTER. I am not so certain that those people who you say would be encouraged to move would not move anyway if they saw an opportunity to live in the United States. In my many tours of investigation throughout the world, I find that practically everybody has a burning desire, and I hope that that will always be the case, to come to the United States.

Now, this disturbs me greatly because several years ago I introduced an amendment on the floor of the House to authorize certain students to work in the United States when it became impossible for them to return to their own lands. It applied principally to the Chinese students in the United States. They came here to study sciences so that they would be able to return to China and attempt to improve the conditions in their country. I venture to guess that there is not a single one who would go back to China today if he was given the opportunity. I know of cases in my own State where these Chinese are doctors today, heads of institutions, hospitals, with their roots firmly implanted. That is the thing that I am wondering about.

Suppose that we encourage these militant anti-Communists to flee? How can the hard-core resistance to this ideology be crystallized anywhere? These people will be spread all over the world. Where would the resistance come from?

Mr. WININGS. I think that this whole measure is tied up with the general program, not only of practical purposes, such as relieving these people who are now a burden to Western Europe, but also, perhaps, of having a very important psychological effect. I do not anticipate that all of them will get out. It is certain that Western Europe cannot itself take care of them alone.

Mr. WALTER. How many can Western Europe take care of?

Mr. WININGS. It has been estimated, I believe, that they could take care of a very large portion of those already there but they have already received more than they can expect to take care of.

Mr. WALTER. The German authorities told this subcommittee that they could absorb about 9 million people and they did not want them to leave. There is a manpower shortage occasioned by the war. Their only problem was with the agriculturalists. There are about a million agriculturalists and there just is not enough land. Do you agree with that?

Mr. WININGS. Our information is that the German Federal Republic feels there is need also to be relieved of some excess population in connection with other than agricultural work at this time. I think what you say, sir, was unquestionably so not too long ago; but they have been receiving these peoples into their area up to the point where they have just about reached their absorptive capacity, even under their recovered economy.

Mr. WALTER. What effect would the enactment of this legislation with these numbers selected arbitrarily have on other peoples?

Mr. WININGS. I regret that I do not get the point of your question, sir.

Mr. WALTER. We have singled out certain people to aid; by excluding others, what effect would that exclusion have on these other people?

Mr. WININGS. From the standpoint of their reaction psychologically and so forth?

Mr. WALTER. I understand that is the principal purpose of this legislation.

Mr. WININGS. Yes. I do not know that a principal purpose can be stated. It has several purposes. The areas selected were selected upon the basis of a very firm belief that these were the most explosive areas, the sore spots, so to speak, with which the program is needed to deal.

Mr. WALTER. Now I call your attention to the Congressional Record of June 2. There is a report of Secretary Dulles on his trip to the Near East and South Asia. The report was placed in the record by Senator Wiley. On page 6070 of the Record of June 2, this is stated:

The United States should seek to allay a deep resentment against it that has resulted from the creation of Israel. In the past we had good relations with the Arab peoples—

and so on. There, by excluding those people from consideration of this legislation, I should think we would be aggravating the feeling of resentment against the United States that now exists.

Mr. WININGS. I think that that is a conclusion which might be reasonably reached but I also, acting again upon information of those who know more about it than I, would say that so far as I know, the purpose of the Secretary in what you have read was to point out difficulties in a certain area of the world without at the same time indicating that there was need of removal of the peoples themselves.

In other words, there is need for increasing perhaps their own ability to absorb and take care of themselves as distinguished from an excess of population itself. I say I did not read the statement that the Congressman read. I gathered that is what he had in mind.

Mr. WALTER. You see, when the iniquitous McCarran-Walter code was written, we dealt with the problem of allaying the feelings of resentment that existed in the East and tried to eliminate that feeling by removing any distinction with respect to race. During the course of the studies of that particular philosophy, I was deeply impressed by the harm that was done in the enactment of the oriental exclusion laws.

Are we not doing exactly the same thing in spelling out this situation the way we do? I have some figures here that I am sure you will agree are authentic. There are 860,000 refugees from Palestine: Arabs; 8 million Pakistanis have fled into India; 7½ million Hindu Moslems fled from India into Pakistan.

Now, in view of the fact that this legislation is only a gesture, and that is what the President's Cabinet officers said it was, do you not feel that we ought to make a gesture in another area so that we do not dramatize the inequities in this legislation? And do you not think it is to our own best interests to allay the suspicion that we are preferring one people over another?

Mr. WININGS. Mr. Congressman, I think the determinations to which you address yourself are not, of course, made at our level. I doubt very much if we would have any satisfactory answer to give to that.

Mr. WALTER. The decision may not be made at your level but you two gentlemen are the heads of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States and if whoever makes the policy decisions does not rely on you, I do not know where they get their information or whom they do rely on.

Mr. WININGS. I would like to say, that the departments which deal with foreign affairs have much knowledge which we do not have in

relation to the situations abroad and doubtless they will address themselves to your question better than we.

I would like, however, to point out this, that I think there is a difference between the enactment of laws excluding the orientals in 1880 and the enactment of laws which allow people to enter the country.

Mr. WALTER. You remind me of the lawyer who was arguing one time in a case that I happened to be in that the precedent I cited did not apply because that had to do with a cow and I was suing a railroad for the death of a horse. The lawyer on the other side argued that it was not a precedent. I am afraid that is what you are going, Mr. Winings.

Mr. WININGS. I hoped to make the point that it is a different thing to keep people out and another to take them in and one was not a precedent for the other.

Mr. WALTER. There is a distinction without a difference.

When you spoke of the other programs, I think you meant IRO and DP. I want to ask you at this time if you think those programs have been satisfactorily concluded? Is that exactly the fact? Are there not a number of people still being held on Ellis Island under the old law, people who were members of proscribed organizations and then not admissible?

Mr. MACKEY. I think we have in the neighborhood of 11, Mr. Congressman, still detained at Ellis Island.

Mr. WALTER. Because of membership in proscribed organizations?

Mr. MACKEY. I think there are probably 1 or 2 of that nature; and the others, obtaining of entries by false and misleading statements. They are there because Germany has refused to take them back and I wrote a letter only Friday to the State Department in that connection.

Mr. WALTER. You say that they gave erroneous information in connection with their applications for visas?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Have you looked at the statement that we put in the conference report on this iniquitous McCarran-Walter Act in order to deal with cases where the misrepresentation is not material?

Mr. MACKEY. The Congressman called that to my attention and we are at this moment getting the reports in the cases.

Mr. WALTER. You see, we knew when we were preparing that law of many cases where people had refused to give the truth or did not give the truth as to their place of birth because they were afraid of the forcible repatriations that certain United States representatives in the IRO were engaging in.

As to membership in proscribed organizations, I would like to remind you of the fact that in applying the well-known rule of later enactments of legislation, that section of the DP Act is repealed.

Mr. MACKEY. That is right.

Mr. WALTER. The people who are being held because of that membership can be admitted and I think they ought to be.

Mr. MACKEY. They can be adjusted. We are trying to get the facts now.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you very much.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Mackey, is it possible at any time to satisfy everybody with immigration bills? It is not possible, is it?

Mr. MACKEY. How well do I know it, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Therefore, if you include some and exclude others, you are always going to develop some favorable comment and some unfavorable comment?

Mr. MACKEY. We make some happy and others unhappy.

Mr. CELLER. Does that situation apply with our quota system?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Would you find that the quota system in some parts of the world is deemed of such a nature as to create resentment?

Mr. MACKEY. Oh, yes; I would think so. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. So that what we are doing here is no different than what has been done all during these years with quota systems, is that not correct? In other words, you help some people and you do not help others. Therefore, you create feelings of resentment and feelings of favor, is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Now I want to say with reference to what Mr. Walter said concerning refugees, the Arab refugees, that was only one side of the shield. Those Arab refugees in the first instance fled from Israel or what was Palestine not because of any coercive measures on the part of the Israelis but primarily upon the urgings of the Arab effendi who wanted to get them out of Israel or Palestine.

Secondly, the other side of the shield primarily is the fact that Israel has taken in far more refugees than left. Israel has taken in from Europe and other parts of the world over 1 million refugees, so that whenever the statement is made that 860,000-odd—I do not know the exact figures—fled from Israel, we must consider the fact that more than that number have already entered Israel.

As to Pakistan and India, I happened to be reading about that. Those two countries are about to settle their differences and are engaged in arrangements for the exchange of populations and it is hoped that they will even settle their differences concerning Kashmir and the populations there that are hostile one to the other, the Hindus and the Mohammedans.

Mr. Mackey, we passed an amendment, did we not, to one of our statutes providing \$100 million to be used to encourage people to to escape from behind the Iron Curtain? The Kersten amendment, is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. I recall that.

Mr. CELLER. If we bring in a small number, and it is only a small number of those who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain called the hard core, I think that is an erroneous expression because it is not the entire hard core. It is only a small part of the hard core. Would there not be many, many other anti-Communists left behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so.

Mr. CELLER. I was in West Berlin as late as the 13th of December and I saw upward of 2,000 refugees fleeing from East Berlin into West Berlin. They are still coming in probably in larger or probably less than that number—I do not know—but they are still streaming in so that one would almost imagine and I say this because what I have seen there that the supply of anti-Communists coming from behind the Iron Curtain is almost inescapable. So that, you see, if we take

these comparatively few anti-Communists, there would still be a hard core of resistance behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so. There are other agencies, though, Mr. Congressman, as you know, who probably would know more about that than I.

Mr. CELLER. Our attempt to aid in this refugee problem cannot be successful unless it is on an international basis, a joint effort with numbers of nations.

Mr. MACKEY. We agree to that; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Would you say that we as world leaders, having that leadership thrust upon us, nothing that we coveted or sought—would you not say as world leaders we must take the lead in this rescue of refugees?

Mr. MACKEY. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Unless we do act, other nations might be loath to act?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. As to the security risks of those who might come in under this bill, is it your experience, or would your experience prompt you to say that those who seek to hurt us, those who are subversives or security risks, are more inclined not to use the regular channels of entrance into this country but would use the irregular channels?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. We have a vast common border with Canada on the north and a vast common border with Mexico on the south; and we have a vast border on the oceans; is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CELLER. It is impossible to adequately patrol all those borders, is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. That is, with the present available manpower it is; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. I think you stated that on the Mexican border you captured or intercepted some half a million illegals? Is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. That is right. It runs now, as of this morning—

Mr. CELLER. That was California?

Mr. MACKEY. Sixty thousand a month in the Imperial Valley. That 500,000, Mr. Walter, was for Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, sir.

Mr. CELLER. For every one that is apprehended, how many go free, have you any idea?

Mr. MACKEY. It would be impossible to state. I would say, hundreds.

Mr. CELLER. So there were at least 500,000 that you did apprehend in the last year?

Mr. MACKEY. It is like sweeping back the tide.

Mr. CELLER. It is almost impossible to do a complete job in that regard?

Mr. MACKEY. With less than 800 border patrolmen, over 200 miles of border, on a 24-hour basis.

Mr. CELLER. Would you say it would be comparatively easy for a Communist spy to get in this way?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. I know not how true that is; I have no way of verifying the statement that for every 1 apprehended there are probably 5 or 6 more that go unapprehended. Have you any idea of that all?

Mr. MACKEY. That is probably true, Mr. Congressman, along the Mexican border? They come in in hordes.

Mr. CELLER. As to those who are covered by the pending bills that we are discussing, they would come in in the regular channels, would they not?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, they would.

Mr. CELLER. They would have the screening prescribed by the Walter-McCarran Act?

Mr. MACKEY. Preexamination overseas.

Mr. CELLER. Those are the provisions laid down by the Walter-McCarran Act?

Mr. MACKEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. CELLER. If they are not strong enough, then we should amend the act to make them stronger, is that correct?

Mr. MACKEY. That act gives us the power to cope with that situation, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. CELLER. Is it adequate?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think so; yes, sir.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask a question at that point as to the screening, Mr. Mackey, of these people, expellees, who conceivably bring into the American and British zones forged papers?

Mr. MACKEY. It is true.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, I have on my desk a report from the secretary of welfare of the State of New York to the effect that over half a million dollars a year is being spent to take care of displaced persons who came to the United States with false pictures of their lungs. They were all excludable because they had tuberculosis. If it is possible to substitute an X-ray picture of good lungs for the X-ray picture of this immigrant's lungs, certainly it would be a very simple matter to bring in forged good-conduct certificates from some police station. That is a common practice.

I want to tell you that from what I know of Canada's experience in immigration: People walk right out of the penitentiary, get a good-conduct certificate from the local police officer and on the basis of that good-conduct certificate, emigrate to Canada. I do not know how many times that has been done in the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Do you not screen those documents?

Mr. MACKEY. Yes, we do and we would, very closely, work with the Counter-Intelligence Corps and the Criminal Investigation Division of the Army. There was some of that, Mr. Congressman, but the ring was broken up.

Mr. WALTER. You think that it would be impossible to do that sort of thing?

Mr. MACKEY. It would not be impossible but we certainly would profit by our experiences in the past.

Mr. WALTER. Somebody estimated that if one 1 percent were criminals and undesirable people, that would add up to a good many, you know. I do not like to take so much time but there is just one more question I would like to ask.

Can you tell me what happened to the displaced persons, where they have been settled?

Mr. WININGS. No, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Have they been pretty well spread throughout the United States or after they were settled did they all go to one place?

Mr. MACKEY. That would appear in the reports of the Displaced Persons Commission.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether you saw this headline in the New York World-Telegram of May 24. It says, "The City," meaning New York City, "Expects a Million Puerto Ricans by 1960."

If you add to that million the people contemplated by this statute, I wonder if they could be absorbed properly?

Mr. MACKEY. That, Mr. Congressman, I think would have to come from the Labor Department.

Mr. CELLER. Are not the Puerto Ricans United States citizens?

Mr. MACKEY. They can move freely.

Mr. CELLER. That is not the subject of this inquiry.

Mr. MACKEY. They are not subject to inspection.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I say a word? We have three other witnesses, including Mr. Carrigg, Monsignor Swanstrom, and Dr. Empie. We have 50 minutes left and Miss Thompson is about to ask a question. We are honestly trying to finish these hearings as quickly as we can in order that we may get down to the drafting of the bill. We must not unduly prolong the hearings.

I would appreciate it if the other witnesses would bear that in mind.

Miss THOMPSON. Commissioner, I should like to refer to your statement. On page 7, will you tell me how these figures were arrived at in regard to the number from these various countries?

Mr. MACKEY. I do not know, Miss Thompson. I took no part in the preparation of this proposed draft.

Miss THOMPSON. I ask that question because you state 20,000 to come from the Netherlands. That figure would not be included, of course, in my number in the bill which I have introduced which provides for admitting 25,000 Dutch refugees.

Mr. MACKEY. I see.

Miss THOMPSON. Is that right?

Mr. MACKEY. That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM. Anything else?

Miss THOMPSON. This 20,000 would not be included in that figure?

Mr. MACKEY. I would think not, Miss Thompson.

Miss THOMPSON. I would just like to say that my figure which provides for 25,000 has been of great interest to the Dutch people in the United States and they tell me they have found a sponsor for every 1 of those 25,000; but now they tell me they are unable to interest 25,000 people to come from the Netherlands to this country. So if we cannot receive 25,000 people under my bill, then certainly there would not be an additional 20,000 that would be interested in coming from the Netherlands?

Mr. MACKEY. That is logical.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentlelady yield? I am rather curious to know about that statement. What is the source of that statement, namely, "the Holland authorities say"?

Miss THOMPSON. Yes, the Dutch people have written me from various places telling me that they cannot interest that number of people in coming to this country.

Mr. CELLER. When I was in Holland, I spoke to the representative of the constituted authorities concerning emigration from Holland and the statement I received as late as the early part of December was quite to the contrary.

Miss THOMPSON. I have that statement.



Mr. CELLER. In other words, your statement is based upon letters, communications received from Holland?

Miss THOMPSON. And from a gentleman who came into my office.

Mr. WALTER. Perhaps in that connection you would be interested in knowing that there are now 600 unused German quota numbers available until June 30, the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. HILLINGS. I think one of the big problems so far as your bill is concerned is that your bill limits the Dutch emigrants, the immigrants into this country, to those people who have been flood victims, and many of those who are flood victims are not inclined to want to leave because it is the sort of thing they have been through many times before. They are farmers primarily who want to stay on the land. Is that not one of the biggest handicaps insofar as that legislation is concerned?

Miss THOMPSON. That may be true. I do not know as to that; but at least we have that information. They do not want to come here temporarily; they probably do not want to come here permanently.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Mackey, there are several questions I would like to ask. However, in order to be able to hear the other witnesses, I will defer them.

We wish to thank you very much for your appearance here, and we will excuse you at this time.

Mr. MACKEY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GRAHAM. Our next witness is our colleague, Mr. Carrigg. Please come forward, sir.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH L. CARRIGG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that all Members of Congress are thoroughly acquainted with the problem of those unfortunates throughout the world who have been uprooted by the scourge of communism and, to save life, honor, and loved ones, have fled from the tyranny of the slave state.

The members of this committee are certainly the best informed group in the country on this subject because of the extensive hearings and inquiries which the committee and its professional staff have conducted. For that reason I intend to be very brief in order that I not take up too much of the committee's time. Please let me add that I am grateful to the committee for affording to me this opportunity to appear here and urge favorable consideration of the legislation which I have introduced, H. R. 4842.

At the outset, let me point out two facts which I believe to be most significant in the committee's consideration of this very grave problem: One, this legislation which I have proposed, and I can say the same for other legislative proposals now pending before the committee, is not suggested as a complete answer to this problem of escapees and refugees from communism. As a matter of fact, the proposal I have offered merely scratches the surface. I would provide for the entry into the United States, over a period of 3 years, of some 380,000 persons. Actually, the number of persons throughout the world for whom provision should be made runs high in the millions.

My second point is this—I do not look upon this problem, grave as it most certainly is, as a problem which should concern only the United States of America. All free nations should put their shoulders to the wheel and do their level best to help in some measure. I propose only that the United States show the way, act in such a manner as to inspire other nations to take up their places in the ranks of free-men and help these unfortunates who desire freedom and hate communism. In addition to the element of inspiration, there is this additional thought to be borne in mind. I think that what I propose fits in well with United States foreign policy, and I feel certain that the present administration is anxious to use moral suasion wherever possible to encourage other free peoples to associate themselves with our policies abroad. However, in this particular field it is not possible; I feel, for our State Department to urge other nations to help in this matter of giving a lift, as it were, to these escapees and refugees unless we chart the course.

We have done well in the matter, I admit. The DP program has given hope and home to many and many a family which otherwise would be languishing in some compound in Europe gradually giving in to complete despair.

I, for one, am mighty proud of what my country has done through the DP program and I am grateful to all, in public and in private life, who helped to make that program such an outstanding success.

My fear at the moment is that much of the good that has been accomplished through that program will be undone if we refuse to acknowledge the fact that the situation which inspired the DP program continues to exist. I want my country to act speedily, not in the sense of assuming the entire burden, but to admit we have a share in this, which is a vital world problem, and through our leadership and persuasion induce other free countries to accept their proper share of the responsibility.

I have proposed in H. R. 4842 that not more than 380,000 special nonquota immigrant visas be made available for this purpose over a period of 3 years. Permit me, if you will, at this point to emphasize this fact—I want this clear—H. R. 4842 contemplates that the entire operation of this program will be within the framework of the present immigration and nationality law. That is spelled out in section 3 of H. R. 4842.

This total number would be broken down into the following categories:

One hundred and fifty thousand German expellees residing in the German Republic, the western sectors of Berlin, or in Austria;

One hundred thousand Italians, uprooted because of the scourge of the war, and who have become an intolerable load on the already overburdened economy of that country;

Twenty-five thousand Greeks who fled Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and so forth, or were made homeless through guerilla warfare;

Twenty-five thousand Dutch nationals and ethnic refugees residing in metropolitan Netherlands. The problem of these people similarly handicaps the Netherlands economy and the difficulties stem largely from the loss of Dutch colonies because of the war;

Fifty thousand non-German World War II refugees and escapees now residing in the German Republic, or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria;

Twenty-five thousand refugees and escapees from the ravages of World War II now residing in NATO countries. In addition to NATO countries, you will note that I have included this same type of refugee residing in Spain, Switzerland, and Sweden. While these countries are not within the NATO organization, the same problems apply with regard to the nonnative refugees. Because of the fear of political or religious persecution they cannot return to their former homes and they seek to find peace, freedom, liberty, employment, and happiness elsewhere.

One thousand five hundred visas to European refugees who fled to China. Some of the refugees in this group will already have left China, but have not been accepted for permanent residence by any country other than the United States.

And, lastly, 3,500 visas to be made available for orphans. This group is perhaps the most pathetic of all. I have attempted, in section 2 of H. R. 4842, to define the type of case I have in mind. These little ones have come the modern-day wanderers, without parents, whether through death, desertion, or abandonment. They have probably never known real homelife having come into the world during the terrible scourge which the gods of war sent screaming through Europe. I sincerely urge the committee to consider their case most carefully.

The other sections of H. R. 4842 are concerned chiefly with assurances, the screening of applicant refugees, priorities, and so forth. I do not at this time feel that there is any need of my taking the committee's time with a discussion of these sections. They follow very closely the pattern set by the displaced persons legislation and I am certain the members of the committee are thoroughly familiar with them. They refer specifically to the Immigration and Naturalization Act and weave its requirements into the administration of the legislation I propose.

I want to assure the committee that I do not regard the numbers I have set out in H. R. 4842 as being sacrosanct. They are the result of studies I have made and come, in some part, from recommendations I have received from experts in this field with whom I discussed the matter before preparing the bill. If the committee in its judgment should decide that as a matter of policy the program should be limited to a period of 2 years rather than 3 years which I propose, then I would naturally expect that the figures I have set out for particular groups should be pared back somewhat in order to make the legislation administratively practicable. The various groups have been identified in the hope that justice and fairness will be done for the greatest possible number of persons in the various groups in need of assistance. The problems vary from group to group as the committee knows.

Please let me assure the committee of my appreciation for this opportunity to appear and make this statement. I shall be happy to return at a later date to submit to the committee any further information which the committee may desire.

Mr. Chairman, by way of emphasis, I would like at this time particularly to call your attention to the differences between H. R. 4842 and Senate 1917, especially as it refers to enforcement. In H. R. 4842, we are asking for visas for 3,500 orphans.

There was one other point in the bill which I wish to call to your attention and that is 1,500 visas to European refugees who fled to China. Some of the refugees in this group will have left China but have not been received for permanent residence by any other country other than the United States.

I would also like, with the permission of the committee, to submit at least one statement, from Mr. Daniel P. Quinn, who has a statement in particular reference to the orphan end of this bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may appear at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. CARRIGG. With that, I ask the committee's approval of whatever portion of my bill they see fit to approve. The numbers are a little bit different because we are spreading ourselves over a period of 3 years and asking for 380,000. If the committee feels in its discretion that it should be limited to 2 years, we are perfectly agreeable that our numbers be cut to meet that demand.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Carrigg, may I ask is there any reference in your bill—I am not thoroughly familiar with it—to the number of Chinese and Orientals who might be admitted?

Mr. CARRIGG. Fifteen hundred, sir.

Mr. HILLINGS. The people that your bill would admit from China, are they not Caucasians who would be refugees from other parts of the world? You are not calling for the admission of actual Chinese, are you?

Mr. CARRIGG. Page 5, section G:

Not to exceed 1,500 visas to refugees who are still in China.

Mr. HILLINGS. Then back on page 2, line 10, you define refugee as meaning "person of European origin——"

Mr. CARRIGG. That is correct.

Mr. HILLINGS. You would not actually be admitting Chinese nationals?

Mr. CARRIGG. No. That is correct, sir.

Mr. GRAHAM. At this point, Mr. Celler would like to have inserted in the record certain statements.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to put in the record certain documents which I gathered while I was touring through eight countries, on the subject of refugees and immigration. Here is one document, for example, *Some Facts About Expellees in Germany*. That is dated 1952. It is issued by the Federal Ministry for Expellees at Bonn.<sup>1</sup>

Then some data I gathered in Munich and Berlin, The Hague, and Rome. I do not want to take the trouble to unfold it here but I think it is very pertinent.

(The documents and data referred to follow:)

SCHEDULE OF REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER DURING HIS VISIT TO THE NETHERLANDS, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, TO SUNDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1952

*Wednesday, December 3*

Congressman and Mrs. Celler are due to arrive at Amsterdam Airport at 11:25 a. m. by airliner from Berlin. No formal events are scheduled for this day.

*Thursday, December 4*

9:45 a. m.—Briefing in the Ambassador's office, third floor, Esso Building, Benoordenhoutseweg 7, The Hague.

<sup>1</sup> Retained in committee files.

10:30 a. m.—Visit to Foreign Ministry: Dr. E. O. Baron van Boetzelaer, Chief of the General Affairs Office; Jhr. Mr. R. C. C. de Savornin Lohman, North American desk.

11:30 a. m.—Conference with Dr. Ir. B. M. Haveman, Commissioner for Emigration, Ministry of Social Affairs.

12:30 p. m.—Lunch with Sir Arnold McNair, President of the International Court of Justice; visit to Peace Palace.

Friday, December 5

12:45 p. m.—Informal luncheon at Cafe Royale, Lange Voorhout, The Hague, as guest of Mr. Clarence E. Hunter, MSA mission chief.

Saturday, December 6

1 p. m.—Luncheon at residence of Mr. William C. Trimble, Embassy counselor and deputy chief of mission.

#### 1 PRESENT POPULATION—INCREASE EACH YEAR

In the following tables you will find a survey of the present population of the Netherlands as far as the Netherlands territory in Europe is concerned (table A) as well as of the annual percentage increase of the population (table B).

##### A. Population on 1 July

	Thousands		Thousands
1939.....	8,761	1950.....	10,103
1948.....	9,793	1951.....	10,262
1949.....	9,995		

Recent calculations of the Central Bureau for Statistics indicate that the potential growth of the population (leaving aside influences of migration) will probably lead to about 11,198,000 inhabitants in 1960, 12,134,000 in 1970 and 13,036,000 inhabitants in 1980.

##### B. Average annual percentage increase

1/7'37-30/6'40.....	1.1	1/7'45-30/6'51.....	1.7
1/7'40-30/6'45.....	0.8		

#### 2 NUMBER OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS EACH YEAR

(a) Liveborn per 1,000 inhabitants:		(b) Deaths per 1,000 inhabitants:	
1939.....	20.6	1939.....	8.6
1948.....	25.3	1948.....	7.4
1949.....	23.7	1949.....	8.1
1950.....	22.7	1950.....	7.5
1951.....	22.3	1951.....	7.6

#### 3. AVERAGE AGE OF A DUTCHMAN

According to the life-tables for the years 1947/1949 the mean length of life of a Dutchman at birth is:

For boys.....	69.4 years
For girls.....	71.5 years

A survey of the mean age of a Dutchman, found by computing the years lived by the total number of live-born inhabitants at a certain moment and dividing the sum by the total number of inhabitants, is given in the following table:

1939.....	30.4
1948.....	30.7
1949.....	30.8
1950.....	30.8
1951.....	(not yet known)

#### 4. NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED

The Government Labour Office estimates the number of premanent unemployed persons, i. e. the total number of unemployed less the number of frictional and seasonal unemployed, as well as the persons for whom it is difficult to find

suitable employment and persons who are only temporarily unemployed, at 55,000 in 1951, 67,000 in 1952, and 78,000 in 1953 (men). The total number of unemployed which, according to the estimates of the above-mentioned bureau can be absorbed in the industrial sector in 1953 amounts to 12,000. It is impossible to give separate figures for the towns and the country districts.

#### 5. EMIGRATION FROM THE NETHERLANDS

Development of emigration since 1946:

Receiving countries	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952 <sup>1</sup>
Canada.....	9	2 361	6 899	6 856	7 033	18 604	20 600
United States of America.....	369	<sup>2</sup> 2 910	<sup>2</sup> 3 128	<sup>2</sup> 2 605	<sup>2</sup> 2 883	<sup>2</sup> 2 262	<sup>2</sup> 2 600
Australia.....	23	95	867	1 619	9 288	10 494	15 760
New Zealand.....		8	95	101	503	3 187	4 600
South Africa.....	16	1 062	2 340	2 021	1 153	2 588	4 350
Brazil.....	40	140	135	407	281	206	315
Argentina.....	12	57	194	137	108	132	145
Other countries (excluding Europe).....	35	183	179	217	101	132	335
Total.....	504	6 816	13 837	13 963	21 330	37 605	48 705

<sup>1</sup> Estimates.

<sup>2</sup> The Netherlands quota for the United States of America is exhausted every year as a result of the fact that the number of Dutchmen migrating to the United States of America from outside the Netherlands comes also under the quota.

#### 6. REFUGEE PROBLEM

The number of refugees in Holland is 9,000 to 10,000. The future development of the Netherlands economically active population according to the "Statistisch Bulletin" of the Central Bureau for Statistics:

Yearly	Economically active population	4 yearly increase	Annual increase
1947.....	3 690 000	180 000	45 000
1951.....	3 870 000		42 000
1955.....	4 040 000		50 000
1959.....	4 240 000		75 000
1963.....	4 540 000		

It is impossible to predict the percentage of the increase of the economically active population which can be absorbed in industry during the next few years. It may, however, be stated that it should be considered desirable to aim at the emigration of about half the increase of the economically active population during the next five years, which, inclusive of the dependents, would amount to at least 60,000 persons a year.

It is necessary to promote emigration the more so as a further increase of the population in the future as a result of the high postwar birth-rates should be reckoned with.

### NETHERLANDS

#### SUMMARY OF IMMIGRATION NOTE TO THE PARLIAMENT, MINISTRY OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC HEALTH, NOVEMBER 1952

##### I. The development of emigration from Holland

(1) *Canada*.—The Netherlands share in Canadian immigration in 1950 and 1951 amounted to almost 10 percent. Since January 1, 1950, the following numbers of emigrants have sailed:

Whole of 1950.....	7,033, approximately	5,500 agrarians.
First 6 months of 1951.....	11,187, approximately	7,500 agrarians.
Whole of 1951.....	18,604, approximately	11,000 agrarians.
First 6 months of 1952.....	15,035, approximately	7,000 agrarians.

As the demand for labor proved to be somewhat less than expected, the Canadian Government was obliged to curtail to some extent the immigration program for

1952, especially with regard to nonagrarians. Although the same curtailments will continue in force for 1953, this will have relatively little influence on emigration from the Netherlands to Canada.

(2) *The United States of America*.—As emigration to the United States of America is entirely dependent on the quota system, it shows no change from year to year.

(3) *Australia*.—At the beginning of 1952 a transport program was agreed upon with the Australian Government, whereby an effort was to be made to transport 20,000 to 25,000 emigrants per annum. In consequence of difficulties in the labor market, the Australian Government decided in June of this year that it would be necessary to limit the immigration of unskilled workers. During the visit of the Australian Minister for Immigration, Mr. Holt, to the Netherlands it was agreed *inter alia* that persons emigrating independently of the migration agreement should be subject to no restrictions; that only agrarians, skilled metal workers and female workers should be able to emigrate under the migration agreement and finally that beginning with the agrarian sector, both Governments should aim at a system by which the Netherlands emigration service and the approved non-governmental organizations in Australia lend their assistance for the placement of the emigrants in that country.

It is, moreover, apparent from statistics of the rate of flow of Netherlands emigrants through the Bonegilla reception camp, that the placement of those who have emigrated since the beginning of April 1952 under the Australian-Netherlands Emigration Agreement has continued almost undisturbed.

Meanwhile, the Australian Government has fixed the volume of its immigration program for 1953 at 80,000, and it can be assumed that the number of Netherlands emigrants will remain equal to that for the current year; i. e., approximately 15,000. The ratio of persons emigrating under the agreement to those emigrating independently will have to be, as it was in the period from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, as nearly as possible 40:60.

(4) *New Zealand*.—Emigration to New Zealand has considerably increased in volume during the last year. The numbers of emigrants to that country have been as follows

	<i>Persons</i>
First 6 months of 1951.....	886
Whole year.....	3, 187
First 6 months of 1952.....	2, 726

whilst by the end of 1952 the total number of Netherlands immigrants in New Zealand will have risen to 10,000.

The cautious immigration policy of the New Zealand Government led them to decide only to admit emigrants of British and Netherlands nationality in 1953, and to choose as starting point for that year a somewhat curtailed program with respect to both groups. Whilst it is expected that a total of approximately 5,500 Dutchmen will emigrate to New Zealand in 1952, it seems possible that the volume of emigration from the Netherlands in 1953 may reach at least 70 percent of that reached this year. In the program provisionally agreed upon between the two Governments, the number of agrarian and female emigrants is not subject to any restriction whilst, as regards the emigrants in industrial occupations, a ratio of 1 skilled to 3 unskilled will be maintained. Unmarried persons will for the most part emigrate under the New Zealand-Netherlands emigration agreement, and married persons independently.

(5) *South Africa*.—The emigration figures from the Netherlands to South Africa have been as follows:

	<i>Persons</i>
Whole of 1950.....	1, 153
First 6 months of 1951.....	1, 225
Whole of 1951.....	2, 588
First 6 months of 1952.....	1, 775

Those leaving the Netherlands for South Africa were mainly building laborers and metal workers, though a large number of artisans and people in other occupations went also. Emigration to the Union is on the increase. For admission to South Africa an employer's declaration is required, or a declaration that the maintenance of the emigrant is assured.

The guarantee fund established in 1950 in South Africa by Dutchmen and Dutch South Africans issues guarantee declarations to eligible emigrants, which are accepted in lieu of employers' declarations. The fund cooperates for this purpose with the Netherlands-South African Association which, by means of the South

African advances fund, takes an active part in financing the passage of emigrants who have little or no capital at their disposal.

(6) *Rhodesia*.—Discussions opened up the possibility of emigration to this country in 1952 for a limited number of Dutchmen, especially railway workers, building laborers, metal workers, and agrarian workers.

(7) *South America*.—The important immigration countries in South America are Brazil and Argentina.

**Brazil:** The so-called *Hospedaria* plan is designed to provide emigrants, whose placement is assured on account of their trade skill, with free accommodation and maintenance in a Government hostel during the period until they find work. This will undoubtedly stimulate emigration to Brazil, as it eliminates the necessity for a work contract with an unknown employer, which has hitherto been a condition for emigration to that country. This plan has already begun to be put into execution.

Last year, with the departure of a small group of pioneers, a start was made with the Castro project, which aims at the settlement of 50 farming families in the State of Parana.

**Argentina:** The Government, by a decree dated February 22, 1952, announced new measures concerning emigration, which aim at increasing the rural population. In order to restrain to some extent the drift from the rural districts to the town, disembarkation permits will in future as a rule only be issued if the place of work is more than 100 kilometers from Buenos Aires.

It was further laid down that the emigrant is bound to remain for 3 years in the place mentioned on his residence permit. Although emigration to Argentina has not as yet assumed large proportions, there has always been a demand for the families of dairy farmers, unmarried milkers, and cattle tenders.

## *II. Subsidizing and transfer of capital*

The Netherlands Government will in future grant subsidies not only to persons who are considered as "nonessential" on the Netherlands labor market, but also to those who are not considered as "nonessential"—i. e., the skilled laborers, unless their special trade skill renders them definitely indispensable in the production process. Besides the subsidy system, consideration is also being given to the introduction of a system of advances, which would mean a fresh widening of the possibilities for emigration.

Moreover, the foreign currency regulations have also become more favorable, so that emigrants are now able to take with them a larger sum to cover their initial expenses. In addition, the emigrant who settles independently may have his property sent over up to a maximum of fl. 15,000 in cash (or 40 percent less for the dollar areas) or of fl. 29,000 in money and goods. The sum of fl. 29,000 may be made up as follows: business inventory from the Netherlands to a value of fl. 15,000 and/or a prefabricated house to a value of fl. 10,000, both excluding costs of transport; whilst in addition a sum of not more than fl. 4,000 can be transferred, in annual installments of fl. 1,000. This fl. 4,000 can also be transferred in the form of goods. This regulation is retroactive to January 1, 1950.

## *III. Spreading of emigration—Training*

For economic reasons the Government is now aiming at spreading the emigrants over more receiving countries, which will at the same time enable more consideration to be given to the capacities of the individual emigrant and the opportunities which he will have for using these capacities in the various receiving countries. This spreading is necessary, as the absorptive capacity of the receiving countries is no longer as great as it was a few years ago, and the requirements of these countries are narrowing down more and more to workers in certain occupational categories.

The increasing demand in the receiving countries for agrarians and certain types of skilled tradesmen or occupational categories, who can supply an urgent need, makes it desirable that intending migrants who perhaps are generally fitted for emigration, but have so far been doing work which is regarded by the receiving countries as nonessential, be given the opportunity of being trained or retrained, thus acquiring an employment history which gives them a greater chance of being accepted by the receiving country. The Government has therefore decided to offer this opportunity annually to thousands of intending migrants, with special emphasis on occupations such as agricultural worker, metal worker, and building laborer, of which the receiving countries are in great need. This training will be given by means of courses at the Government training centers and, for agricultural workers, by means of a theoretical and practical training in which the Ministry of Agriculture cooperates.



#### *IV. Transportation of migrants*

Two ships are to be added to the number already in use for the transportation of emigrants. No decision has yet been taken as to the ways and means of acquiring these.

As regards aircraft suitable for the transportation of emigrants, a number of aircraft now used for this transport will of necessity have to be replaced in 1955. With this in view and in order to meet the increased need for transport, 3 modern aircraft have been ordered, which will become available in 1954, 1955.

In 1952 approximately 10,000 emigrants are being transported by chartered ships.

The majority of these charters have been concluded in cooperation with the PICMME, this organization undertaking to shoulder the dollar obligations entailed by these agreements against payment by the Netherlands Government of the equivalent in sterling. This highly advantageous cooperation has saved the Netherlands the expenditure of upwards of a million dollars in 1952. It is uncertain as yet whether the dollar funds of PICMME make such a regulation possible for 1953. In view of this uncertainty it has been agreed with PICMME that, in the event of the Netherlands Government needing to charter ships again in the coming year for the transportation of migrants, the possibility of taking over the dollar commitments involved will in future be examined in each individual case.

---

[From Algemeen Nederlands Pers Bureau A. N. P.]

#### EMIGRANTS MAY TAKE MORE

THE HAUGE, November 11.—Wider facilities for the transfer of capital and goods by Dutch emigrants are announced in a note on emigration submitted to Parliament by the Minister of Social Affairs and Public Health.

Apart from the higher amounts of currency which emigrants will now be allowed to take with them, and which were announced recently, they can now transfer 15,000 guilders in cash or up to 29,000 guilders' worth of goods from property left behind in Holland.

The new capital-transfer arrangement will apply to all emigrants who left Holland since January 1, 1950, although "incidental exceptions" may be made for those who left earlier.

The note explains that the favorable development of Holland's payments balance and the present foreign-exchange position have made these facilities possible.

Since October 1, last, emigrants' cash allowances have been almost doubled. Heads of families and single persons can get up to 1,500 guilders' worth of currency, the "first member" of the family (the one who does the household), 750 guilders' worth and the other members of the family 400 guilders' worth each.

Subsidized emigrants will also be able to obtain a larger allowance, the note says.

In addition, emigrants may transfer up to 15,000 guilders in money. Such a transfer will, however, not be permitted before the emigration attaché and the emigration officials under him have ascertained the way in which the money will be used, the note says.

#### LESS IN DOLLARS

The note adds that in view of Holland's still difficult dollar position only 60 percent of the proposed amounts will apply generally for the dollar area.

An alternative measure is proposed for those who prefer to transfer from Holland goods needed for their settlement, rather than money. Goods to a value of 15,000 guilders, provided they are of European origin, as well as a prefabricated house to a maximum of 10,000 guilders, may be transferred. In addition, these emigrants may make over annual amounts of 1,000 guilders to a maximum of 4,000 or alternatively an additional quantity of goods up to that amount.

The note says the new 15,000 guilders' cash facility and the alternative arrangements for 29,000 guilders cover approximately 97 to 98 percent of the emigrants wishing to transfer their capital to the country of immigration.

The Minister plans to ask the advice of the Emigration Council before deciding whether to grant credits to emigrants not leaving capital behind in Holland.

Dealing extensively with emigration policy, the note says the Government advocates an "active" emigration policy. It will foster the migration of Dutch people living abroad to overseas territories and to other territories where these

Dutchmen can build up a livelihood. Regarding permanent settlement by foreigners in Holland, the Government will act "with the reserve which our demographic situation demands," though recognizing the desirability of the freest possible intra-European migration.

The Government will see to it that "active enlightenment" will give prospective emigrants a correct understanding of demands posed by emigration, and of the opportunities for emigration.

#### TRAINING

The Government has decided to give initial training as agricultural or industrial worker to several thousand aspirant emigrants annually from "vulnerable" professions or regions. The teaching of English will also be promoted, the note says.

To consolidate and further expand Holland's position as emigration country, the present stream of emigrants will be spread out more widely over the receiving countries while the Government is continuing to examine new emigration opportunities.

Referring to Dutch people repatriated from Indonesia, the note says emigration opportunities for them are being studied in several parts of the world. But, it warns, experiences so far do not warrant big expectations of the ultimate results.

In the coming budget year the Government will be guided in granting financial aid by the desirability of fostering the departure of everyone suitable and willing to emigrate. But, it is stressed, this will not apply if an aspirant emigrant is indispensable to Dutch production because of his capacities. The Government also reserves the right to change its line of conduct should it appear that the proportion between the workers leaving the country who can hardly be spared, and those who can be spared more easily, becomes unacceptable.

The Government says it will ask the advice of the Emigration Council whether a system of advances against guaranties should be introduced for emigrants to cover the costs of their emigration, and whether credits could be granted to certain emigrants for their housing and establishment of an independent profession.

The Government will foster as far as possible that emigrants not leaving under the auspices of a receiving government will be given help in finding a suitable job and housing. The emigration of those who have a sponsor—government or private institution or person—in the receiving country is considered the most responsible form of migration, the note declares. The Government will also foster well-considered and well-prepared plans for colony or group emigration to those countries whose Governments are prepared to aid such projects.

The Government note says arrangements are being prepared to expand the transport capacity.

"Great attention" will be paid to the further development of cultural and economic relations between Holland and the receiving countries, to which emigration has led, and the Government will stimulate private initiative which can further this development.

#### STATISTICS

The note contains various statistics on Dutch emigration which showed the following steady rise since the war: 504 (1946); 6,816 (1947); 13,837 (1948); 13,963 (1949); 21,220 (1950); 37,605 (1951); and 28,846 (first half of 1952).

In the first 6 months of this year, 15,035 emigrants went to Canada, 1,367 to the United States, 6,964 to Australia, 2,726 to New Zealand, 1,775 to South Africa, 82 to Brazil, 65 to the Argentine, and 102 to other countries outside Europe.

Giving emigration figures by profession, the note states that, of the 11,676 people in professions who emigrated in the first half of 1952, the largest number came from agriculture (2,869). Some other figures are: metal industry, 1,797; administrative professions, 1,354; building trade, 1,268; various, 781; personal services, 743; commerce, 713; land transport, 528; foodstuffs, 483; clothing and footwear, 226; carpentry, 206; catering industry, 145; textile, 136; paper and graphic industry, 109; leather and rubber, 79; chemical industry, 67; water transport, 70; mining industry, 51; earthenware, glassware, and brick industries, 37; and banking and insurance concerns, 14.

The note further shows emigration according to religious denominations, giving figures for 1951 and the first half of 1952: Roman Catholic, 10,659 and 9,135; Netherlands Reformed, 10,001 and 7,740; Calvinists, 10,852 and 7,225; other denominations, 1,469 and 3,144; no denomination, 4,625 and 3,144.

Calvinist emigrants still prefer Canada, while the number of Catholic emigrants to Australia and New Zealand has increased greatly.

Giving figures on transport for 1951 and the first half of 1952, respectively, the note says 21,541 and 19,312 emigrants left on ships chartered by the Government: 3,989 and 3,779 went by Dutch shipping lines, 5,185 and 1,342 by foreign ships, 6,783 and 4,226 by Dutch planes, and 93 and 78 by foreign planes. Of 14 and 109 it is not known what means of transport was used.

---

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY

Berlin Element

NOVEMBER 18, 1952.

Office memorandum.

From: Cultural Affairs, High Commission, Germany, Berlin Element, James C. Flint.

Subject: Refugees in Berlin.

Since war's end, Berlin has accepted nearly 300,000 uprooted people. Approximately 150,000 of them were German expellees from the areas of the expanded Third Reich. Coming in 1945-46, they have since integrated themselves more or less successfully into the Berlin economy; some finding employment, others existing on relief. The other 150,000 are refugees from the Soviet Zone, a part of 275,000 such escapees, who from 1949 on have sought asylum in Berlin. (See attached chart.) The remaining 125,000 have been transported to the Federal Republic, or of their own volition returned to the German Democratic Republic. Monthly, new thousands are being added to the Berlin total; the average for the last quarter exceeded 7,500 persons per month.

On February 4, 1952, Berlin accepted the Federal Republic's legislation on the reception of refugees. All applicants for refugee status had to appear before screening teams. If screeners were satisfied that a refugee had fled because of because of danger to life or for other sufficiently pressing reasons, classification as a recognized political refugee followed. Such recognition carried with it the right to work and to establish residence. The Federal Government agreed to accept 80 percent of all recognized political refugees, while the remaining 20 percent were to stay in Berlin. The Federal Republic would take no nonrecognized refugees. If they could not be persuaded to return to the German Democratic Republic, they stayed in Berlin, receiving from the city minimum social assistance. (Amounts differ with individual cases, but help would not exceed 90 deutschemarks per month for single people, nor 200 deutschemarks per month for a family.)

The federal legislation was designed to dam the flow of refugees. Statistics show it was achieving its aim. Refugee arrivals in Berlin in the month of April 1952 were lower than those of January and February 1952, despite the fact that with good weather a seasonal increase in refugees was expected. Figures were also below the corresponding period of the year previous.

The legislation would have continued to work except for events in the East Zone. Early in May, party leaders' speeches intimated that youth could expect military service. By June, the "cordon sanitaire" had been established between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, and escape over the the East-West border was no longer safe. In July, the Soviets threatened to isolate Berlin from the East Zone. In August, they stepped up their program of sovietization, with the expropriation of property and new pressures on the petty bourgeoisie.

From June 1 onward, Berlin became the one safe exit for the endangered and the fearful, and the refugee stream into Berlin grew proportionately. In June, out of a total of 14,300 refugees registered in Berlin and the Federal Republic, 52.2 percent were recorded in Berlin, whereas in October, out of a total of 16,500 refugees recorded in Berlin and the Federal Republic, the percentage of those passing through Berlin had climbed to 94.

Screening teams were constrained to liberalize their interpretation of what constituted danger to life and pressing reasons for flight. In June 1952, of the total arrivals, only about one-third were given status as recognized refugees; in October, nearly two-thirds of the total arrivals received recognition.

Youth refugees—boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 24—have since May made up an increasing and disproportionately large percentage of refugees. (See attached chart.) In the quarter February through April, youth refugees were a little less than 20 percent, whereas in the quarter just completed, youth

refugees have been approximately 25 percent. Youth refugees arriving alone—that is, not as part of a family group—are not held in Berlin for screening. Depending upon the availability of airspace, they are flown immediately to camps in the Federal Republic. The camp for male youth is located at St. Bostel, and that for girls at Loccum, both in Niedersachsen.

With the increased numbers of refugees and the lowering of standards for recognition, there has been a corresponding increase in the number of people transported to the Federal Republic. The following table shows not only its size, but also the acceptance, by Laender, of refugees in the Federal Republic:

Laender	May	June	July	August	September	October
Hamburg.....	28	73	89	107	146	188
Bremen.....	24	21	43	34	70	72
Schleswig-Holstein.....			19	45	25	13
St. Bostel (male youth).....	440	1,185	1,323	1,450	2,172	3,009
Lower Saxony.....	11	14	76	69	141	204
North-Rhine/Westphalia.....	440	864	1,073	3,936	3,802	4,031
Friedland.....	24	22	40	27	17	18
Loccum (female youth).....	226	228	291	503	648	938
Hesse.....	175	195	115	167	152	394
Rhineland/Palatinate.....	340	278	121	130	105	109
South-Baden.....	151	176	80	247	456	125
Wuerttemberg-Baden.....	153	383	351	559	808	1,217
Wuerttemberg-Hohenzollern.....	140	128	44	139	395	149
Bavaria.....	9	83	120	126	152	238
Old cases.....	14	22				
Total.....	2,175	3,672	3,785	7,539	9,089	10,705

All refugees go by commercial air, with travel costs, averaging about DM 60 per person, paid by the Federal Republic. Laender representatives stationed in Berlin, determine, in relationship to space available, the percentage of recognized refugees to be relocated in the different Laender. Screening and processing time runs from 4 to 6 weeks. During this period, refugees live in Berlin transit camps. Part of Berlin's 20 percent share of recognized refugees live in permanent camps and private homes, as do the nonrecognized. Berlin has 64 refugee camps, 38 permanent camps with a capacity of 6,128, and 26 transit camps with a capacity of 11,596. Many of the transit camps are partially destroyed factory buildings hastily improvised to house Berlin's unexpected guests.

Breakdown by professions (see attached chart) reveals the largest number of refugees to be young people without particular professional training. Next come the workers, with a preponderant number of people employed in industry and a large number of people employed as clerks, stenographers, and white-collar workers. Professionally trained people have been low in the rankings, as have farmers. October saw a sudden, sharp increase in refugees from these two groups. It also brought a greater number of pensioners and socially nonproductive people; and likewise, more students. All this is accepted by Berlin refugee authorities as an indication that present Soviet measures are now directed most strenuously at farmers, students, and the middle class.

From this date forward, as a regular supplement to this report, Cultural Affairs Branch, HICOG Berlin element, will prepare weekly record sheets containing the following information: Refugee arrivals in West Berlin, recognition and non-recognition statistics; numbers known to have returned to the DDR; numbers flown to West Germany, with a breakdown according to destination; breakdowns by profession, and age groupings of refugees processed in Berlin. Monthly summaries will also be prepared for circulation. Items of special interest or importance will be appended to such reports.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
AMERICAN CONSULATE,  
Berlin, Germany, December 2, 1952.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CELLER: Reference is made to our conference of Monday morning, December 1, 1952, and particularly to our remarks concerning the possible increase of the figure of 21,000 visas to be issued to refugees as contemplated by your proposed legislation, H. R. 7376.

It was the feeling of the Berlin representatives having to do with immigration and refugee matters that the rather considerable numbers of persons arriving currently as refugees from the Soviet Occupied Zone of Germany who would not be classifiable among the 117,000 ethnic Germans covered elsewhere in your proposed legislation might well use up the relatively smaller 21,000 figure. Since the German quota is nearly current, any eligible German-born person may emigrate fairly quickly. The Berlin Consulate alone, however, has about 40,000 quota registrants, many of them refugees from the Soviet Zone, who are not eligible solely because they cannot secure regular immigration affidavits of support. It is assumed that many of them, through the many voluntary agencies in Berlin, would be able to secure the assurances contemplated in your legislation.

We felt that the 21,000, or preferably a larger number, should be used for apparently more needy persons, that is, those relatively recent arrivals from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Iron Curtain countries excluding the Soviet Occupied Zone of Germany, who are not ethnic Germans.

Speaking for Berlin only, it was the feeling of the representatives present that most of the ethnic Germans, who speak the German language and have a knowledge of German tradition, are fairly well integrated into the German economy. It must, however, be pointed out that they are a marginal group and that in case of an economic downturn they would be the first to suffer.

The feeling, therefore, was that your bill's figure for refugees might be raised to about 50,000, possible at the expense of the ethnic German provision.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. STREEPER,  
*American Consul General,*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
*Washington, December 17, 1952.*

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CELLER: I hasten to transmit to you a collection of material from your meeting with American voluntary agencies on November 28, 1952, at Frankfurt am Main.

This material was sent to the Department on December 11 by Mr. Elmer M. Falk, Chief of the Escapee Program Division, Office of the United States High Commissioner, Frankfurt, and arrived on my desk late yesterday afternoon.

It includes—

1. List of participants
2. Résumé of meeting
3. Statement National Catholic Welfare Conference
4. Statement Lutheran World Federation
5. Statement World Council of Churches
6. Letter from American Joint Distribution Committee

I sincerely hope that your recent trip was both interesting and enjoyable and that you found our people helpful wherever you went.

Sincerely yours,

BEN H. BROWN, Jr.,  
*Acting Assistant Secretary.*

(Enclosure: Material from Frankfurt am Main.)

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE MEETING HELD WITH AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES AND THE HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER, AT FRANKFURT, ON NOVEMBER 28, 1952

The Honorable Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary  
Mr. Elmer M. Flak, Chairman, Chief PEP program for Germany  
Mr. Guy J. Swope, special assistant on refugees to the High Commissioner  
Mr. Richard R. Brown, Director, Office of Field Coordination (PEP)  
Mr. Eric M. Hughes, Deputy Director, Office of Field Coordination (PEP)  
Mr. Harry Grossman, Deputy Chief, PEP program for Germany  
Mr. Raymond O. Didlo, fiscal budgeting officer, PEP program for Germany  
Mr. James E. Crosby, Chief Screening Officer, PEP program for Germany  
National Catholic Welfare Conference:

Mr. James J. Norris, European director, Frankfurt  
Mr. John L. Bauer  
Rev. Alfred Schneider, director of Germany, Frankfurt

**Lutheran World Federation:**

Rev. Gerhard Dietrich, director of Germany, Frankfurt  
Miss Clara Anderson

**World Council of Churches:**

Mr. Raymond E. Maxwell, representative for Germany, Bad Homburg  
Mr. William F. Hastings, Stuttgart

**American Joint Distribution Committee:**

Mr. Henry L. Levy, emigration director, Paris  
Mr. Samuel L. Haber, director of Germany, Munich

**American fund for Czechoslovak refugees:**

Mr. Ferdinand Jicinsky, European director, Munich

**American Hungarian Relief:**

Miss Edith Weiss

**Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society:**

Mr. Henry Klausner, Munich

**Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.:**

Mrs. Doris Duffy, deputy director of Germany

**United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America:**

Mr. Izidorius Rugienius, German director, Munich  
Mr. E. H. Ruksa, Munich

**United Ukrainian-American Relief Committee:**

Mr. Simon Y. Kalba

**YMCA/YWCA:**

Mr. W. S. Kilpatrick, senior representative for Germany and Austria  
Mr. Conrad Allard, Munich

**World ORT Union:**

Mr. Albert Goldman, director of Germany

**RÉSUMÉ OF MEETING OF AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES AND THE HONORABLE  
EMANUEL CELLER, AT FRANKFURT AM MAIN, NOVEMBER 28, 1952**

The chairman opened the meeting with general remarks and then introduced Congressman Celler who expressed his appreciation for the large attendance of voluntary agency personnel. Mr. Celler then briefly discussed H. R. 7376 which he introduced to the 82d Congress, 2d session. This bill would authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota visas to persons of German ethnic origin, natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and certain refugees. Mr. Celler indicated his intention to reintroduce this bill to the coming session of Congress and stated that he was therefore quite interested in securing any comments or recommendations which the voluntary agencies might have.

All agency representatives were unanimous in their support of H. R. 7376 and expressed to Mr. Celler gratitude for his efforts in sponsoring the proposed bill. Pastor Dietrich, Lutheran World Federation; Mr. Hastings, World Council of Churches; and Mr. Morris, National Catholic Welfare Conference, read prepared statements outlining the position of their respective agencies concerning the proposed legislation. Copies of these statements are attached.

The statements served as the basis for further discussion which resulted in the following unanimous recommendations by the agencies:

1. The May 8, 1945, dateline in section 2 (b) of the bill should be changed to September 1, 1939. This is the same date that was used in the Displaced Persons Act and would make it possible to resettle several thousand DP's who were in processing under that act when all available visa numbers were used up at the same time as the act expired on December 31, 1951.

2. Section 4 (f) should be amended to include 50,000 refugees rather than 21,000. Agencies stated that this would make it possible to cover all escapees from communism as well as the remaining displaced persons who are interested in and qualified for resettlement to the United States. While agencies were unable to give accurate statistics concerning the numbers of refugees currently remaining in various European countries, they all expressed complete confidence that the 50,000 figure would be sufficient. Mr. Norris indicated that there were considerable numbers of refugees in both France and Belgium that should be included in this legislation and that if there were only 21,000 permitted, the number would not be large enough to include refugees in these countries. Congressman Celler pointed out that any increase in the total number of refugees to be admitted would make it additionally difficult to have the bill favorably acted

upon and also corresponding reductions would have to be made in the numbers to be admitted under other sections of the act, thus keeping the total to 300,000.

Agencies also pointed out the need to have a more liberal interpretation of "firmly resettled" and that this should preferably be covered in the legislation or congressional intent be so indicated that the regulations would be written to provide a liberal interpretation.

Mr. Haber of the American Joint Distribution Committee, made certain comments on behalf of his agency and at Mr. Celler's request subsequently presented his comments in letter form. A copy of his letter is attached. Several other agency representatives made comments which fundamentally endorsed the ideas and recommendations that had already been discussed on the basis of the original papers that had been prepared.

Congressman Celler expressed his thanks to the meeting for the fine spirit that had been evidenced and for the sound recommendations which had been made. He indicated that they would be given serious consideration prior to the reintroduction of his bill. The voluntary agencies in turn expressed their appreciation to Congressman Celler, following which the meeting was adjourned.

---

STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE EMANUEL CELLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BY JAMES J. NORRIS, EUROPEAN DIRECTOR OF WAR RELIEF SERVICES, NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE, ON BEHALF OF PRIVATE AGENCIES WORKING FOR REFUGEES, EXPELLEES, AND OVERPOPULATED COUNTRIES, FRANKFURT AM MAIN, NOVEMBER 28, 1952

Mr. Congressmen, we are grateful to you for this opportunity to present to you a statement on behalf of refugees and other peoples who look to the United States of America for leadership in helping to resolve some of their problems. The private organizations represented here today have, during the past 5 years, helped to resettle more than 500,000 refugees and expellees in many countries. They are well aware of the fact that it was United States Government aid which made the greater part of their work possible, both through financial assistance to governmental agencies and through the legislation embodied in the Displaced Persons Act.

The Displaced Persons Act contributed substantially toward solving the immediate problem of the IRO DP's, but a combination of causes as prevented a solution to the problems of refugees and overpopulation with which western Europe is struggling.

The legislation introduced by you earlier this year was a forward step. We are hopeful that some action will be taken in the next session of Congress to pass legislation which will permit the entry into the United States of a fair share of refugees and surplus peoples, for without such example other nations can, without fear of criticism, continue their newly-established restrictive policies on immigration.

As organizations working for people in need, by our very nature we help anyone in need. A refugee who flees persecution does not determine in advance that he is to fit into a "category" or meet a "deadline" in order to become eligible for assistance. He does not plan to flee into a certain country of asylum because he will be eligible for more aid there than in another country. The man being persecuted in a so-called "ineligible" country does not stop to think that he does not qualify for assistance. Private agencies helping these refugees must treat all alike and accept them for what they are: children of God who are equal before Him and before those of us who serve them.

Using this principle as a basis, we would ask that future legislation to help refugees—

- (1) Give consideration to true refugees wherever they may be and eliminate deadlines and "categories" which create discriminations and hardships.

- (2) In planning legislation to help refugees, the definition should cover those requiring international legal protection, and are without the protection of a government.

- (3) Terminology such as "firm resettlement" should be given an interpretation based on something other than local political considerations.

- (4) Provision should be made for voluntary agencies to provide corporate affidavits, or assurances guaranteeing against immigrants becoming public charges.

(5) Authorize completion of the processing of approximately 7,500 IRO displaced persons, 1,600 Venezia Giuliani, 3,000 German ethnics, and 500 orphans who were processed but not visaed under the DP Act.

In addition to the provisions of H. R. 7376, new legislation should extend the provision to permit the entry of a limited number of orphan children.

The agencies at this meeting are overburdened with demands for help from many sides. They are continuing to help the more than 250,000 IRO refugees who have lost all international assistance. They are working for new refugees and escapees, and in doing so are cooperating with the President's escapee program, for which they are appreciative but hopeful that it will be extended in scope. They are helping to relieve the plight of the thousands of refugees fleeing from the Soviet zone of Germany, and with the refugees seeking Austria, Trieste and Italy as a haven. Some of us are expending a substantial amount of our resources in helping the expellees in Germany and Austria. The agencies have programs for refugees in other western European countries where there are refugees—France, Belgium, and Sweden being the principal ones. They reach their helping hands into Turkey, Greece, the Middle East, India, Pakistan, Hong Kong, and Korea. They live day and night with the problems of refugees. Around the world they count 38 million refugees, homeless and displaced peoples.

The private-agency people are realists—they know that the vast majority of these people without homes must find a living where they now are, awaiting a return to their homes, which may never come about. But much can be done to help by resettling a relatively small number from areas of acute need. It is for these that we ask Congress to pass legislation, and to you, personally, Mr. Celler, who have had vision coupled with a spirit of charity, we express our gratitude for your leadership.

---

LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW REFUGEE LEGISLATION PRESENTED TO CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER, NOVEMBER 28, 1952, BY REV. GERHARD DIETRICH

The Lutheran World Federation Service to Refugees in Germany believes that emigration from Germany is an essential part of the solution to the refugee problem which now faces this country. We believe that the United States, as a leader in international welfare problems and as a country traditionally based on immigration, should also provide leadership in this problem by taking its full share of these refugees together with the other countries of the world who can provide homes and futures for these people. Most of us represented here are Americans who are descendants of immigrants that left Europe within the last three centuries because of political, economic, or social conditions existing at that time. We who are fortunate enough to be descendants of these immigrants should not deny the same rights to the refugees of today.

#### I PERMANENT LEGISLATION

We believe that the only permanent solution to the immigration problem for the United States is a complete rethinking and revisal of our regular immigration legislation allowing for adjustments according to our needs and the needs of the emigrating country. However, since the new McCarran immigration law was passed at the last session of Congress, we feel that it will probably be many months before consideration will be given to new permanent legislation. In the meantime the pressing situation in Germany is continuing. The tensions arising from poor housing, unemployment, and social insecurity are driving some of the millions of refugees to despair, hopelessness, and often radicalism. We in the United States must do our part through emergency legislation and do it immediately.

#### II. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

We recommend that—

- (a) Emergency legislation be passed at the next session of Congress.
- (b) Such emergency legislation be refugee legislation with the admission to the United States based upon the fact that the immigrant is a refugee who has lost his homeland.
- (c) This legislation provide for eligibility on the basis of the country where the refugee is now residing, regardless of national, ethnic, or racial background.
- (d) Priority be given to those who were in the pipeline under the displaced-persons bill, as amended in 1950, who for various reasons were not able to complete their processing.



(e) The legislation be flexible so that it can be interpreted according to the needs existing at the time in which it is in operation.

(f) New legislation avoid mention of a dateline.

(g) There be no blanket exclusions for reasons such as previous party membership or military service.

(h) The legislation be more lenient for these refugees in the matter of health and uneconomic family members, especially where the family can be admitted to the United States and become self-supporting, but is split or held back because of the inadmissibility of one family member.

(i) The immigration to the United States under this legislation be above and outside the normal quota with no mortgaging of regular quotas.

(j) The voluntary agencies be used as counseling agencies, assisting in the emigration, but not responsible for providing assurances, affidavits, or bonds.

(k) The emergency legislation be administered directly by the State Department through the regular consulates in Germany. We believe that in this way much of the redtape of the previous bill can be avoided. This would eliminate many of the hardships for applicants and provide for a more economic operation.

### III. CELLER BILL

In closing we would like to say to Representative Celler in regard to his proposed legislation that—

(a) We are very grateful to Representative Celler for his efforts in behalf of emergency legislation.

(b) We are also happy that he recommended a large number of immigrants each year.

(c) It is our expressed opinion that his proposal would have received more speedy and positive consideration had it been limited to refugee immigration.

### A STATEMENT IN REGARD TO THE REFUGEE SITUATION IN GERMANY FROM THE REFUGEE SERVICES, WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, NOVEMBER 28, 1952, PRESENTED BY WILLIAM F. HASTINGS, CHIEF OF RESETTLEMENT IN GERMANY

We are indeed grateful to Congressman Celler for this opportunity to present the situation we are facing as we seek to help refugees in Germany. We also would express our very deep gratitude to him and his committee for good service rendered to displaced persons and other refugees in the past, as well as for help which he and the committee may be able to give in the future.

#### 1. THE SITUATION

The situation as we see it is as follows:

Of approximately 150,000 DP's left in Germany, the World Council of Churches is responsible for over 50,000. Also out of the 8 or more million ethnic Germans (Volksdeutsche) in Germany, the number who wish to emigrate can be estimated in the hundred thousands. Of these, perhaps nearly 10 percent might look to us for help in emigration, a percentage depending on the proportion who belong to Reformed and Orthodox Churches. There is in addition an increasing group of escapees from Iron Curtain countries, including East Germany. They crossed the border after January 1, 1949, and, therefore, were not eligible under the DP Act of 1948 as amended in 1950. Up till last July about 20,000 came over monthly, and many are still coming. Of these, 15 to 20 percent would probably look to us for help if a way for emigration to the United States were opened.

In all, the World Council of Churches and its cooperating organization in the States, Church World Service, brought to the States over 60,000 DP's and ethnic Germans. Well over 58,000 came from Germany, Austria, and Italy, and of these about 85 percent were from Germany itself. During the last year the World Council of Churches has resettled nearly 10,000 refugees, of which 7,000 went to the States. This included 3,358 from Germany who went to the States and 212 to other countries. The door is opening somewhat for these people in Brazil and Canada, but unfortunately other countries have tended to follow the lead of the United States and have shut their gates except for small cracks, through which a very few can squeeze. If the United States could pass new emergency legislation, we believe that would almost certainly help these doors to open much wider.

## II. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

1. Since it may take time to effect needed amendments in the Walter-McCarran Omnibus Immigration Act, we hope that special emergency legislation may be attempted very soon.

2. We hope further that this will provide for—

(a) Those eligible DP's who failed to get visas under the DP law of 1948 as amended in 1950;

(b) For those not sufficiently provided for in that bill, including the ethnic-German refugees;

(c) A fair share, under proper security safeguards, of those who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain since January 1, 1949.

In this connection we express the hope that the dateline for eligibility may be removed, or at least moved up to sometime in 1952.

3. In consultation with the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the Lutheran World Federation we have arrived at a figure of 250,000 refugees which we believe can readily be absorbed into the United States during the next 3 years.

4. We feel that our first responsibility is to the displaced persons left in Germany, and second to the ethnic-German group. We wonder if the figure of 117,000, which appeared in H. R. 7376 of the 82d Congress, may be retained as the number of those in Germany to be helped by emergency legislation. If so, we trust that all or nearly all of the 117,000 will be refugees. The World Council of Churches would be glad also to help a few of those persons who represent surplus population, and especially in some other countries than Germany. If it is felt imperative to include provision for surplus population in emergency legislation, we hope that the fact may be clearly understood by the American public. These people often need help but their situation is not so critical as that of refugees, and the governments of the countries where these people now live are anxious to help refugees first.

5. In the experience of the World Council of Churches and Church World Service the physically handicapped, including amputees, is even better than the excellent record of refugees as a whole. We hope, therefore, that special provision may be made for these people, including rehabilitation funds and more leniency in regard to public charge bonds. We believe further that our doors might well be opened farther for families having a handicapped child or an aged person for whom other members of the family will clearly be responsible.

6. The fact that smaller nations like Holland, Norway, Sweden, and France have provided for a number of hard core cases including the blind, aged, and TB patients represents a challenge to those of us who are from the United States. It would seem further that the goodwill of European peoples toward the United States could easily be increased if at public expense we would help a fair share of these people by placing them in old or new institutions in the United States. Public charge regulations obviously could not apply to such cases. What we do for this group must be an outright gift, but it would also seem an excellent investment from the standpoint of international public relations.

7. From the standpoint of emergency needs, it would seem more reasonable to select refugees for emigration on the basis of the desperate conditions in their country of asylum rather than on the basis of national origin or country of birth. Proper security safeguards would screen out anyone dangerous to the safety of the United States.

8. Finally we come to a very important matter: Experience with refugee emigrants to the United States thus far would seem to teach very strongly that it is difficult to produce the best results by means of assurances like those used under the DP Act. The process seems like that of attempting to fit keys made in Europe into locks made in America. Particularly in spite of good-faith oaths, it has been difficult to keep DP's and Ethnic Germans from leaving farms for less lonely and better paid situations in the cities. In order to supply the great need for farm workers, and to satisfy American employers and sponsors, we suggest that it would be far better to bring eligible refugees to the States, and put them in reception centers at Government expense. Employers and sponsors could then visit the camps, and conclude an actual job-housing contract with the DP on a face-to-face basis. Such contracts in other countries such as Canada seem to have worked out well, and the farmers especially have stayed in their original job and community far better than in the States. Voluntary agencies could be expected to cooperate in locating job-housing opportunities and in helping new immigrants to integrate into American life. Our own experience with Church World Service

shows conclusively that best results have been obtained in our joint effort where individuals and families have been directly under the care of churches, and this could still be the case under the new method here proposed.

### III. AMENDMENT OF WALTER-M'CARRAN BILL

Widespread dissatisfaction with the Walter-McCarran bill suggests revision especially at the following points:

1. Provision should be made for the pooling or adjusting of quotas at the end of a year, so that 162,000 can actually come to the United States as provided in the bill. As the matter stands probably not more than one-half of that number will come. If say 25 percent of the unused quotas could be used for refugees that might well solve the matter of their eligibility to the United States on the necessary long-term basis.

2. Care should be taken to remove all discrimination on account of race, color, or sex.

3. In order for the law to be in line with our traditions of democracy and fair-play, the bill should be amended to provide for a fair system of judicial hearings and appeals before a court.

4. We hope further that the mortgages against national quotas incurred under the old DP Act may be forgiven. It seems a mistake for instance that since the Baltic peoples have done so well in the United States, their quotas should be mortgaged so far ahead, that for Latvia being affected up to the year 2274.

### IV. CONCLUSION

On the whole our experience with refugees resettled in the United States has been a very happy one, and we have seen hundreds of letters from sponsors which say so. A small proportion of new Americans have proved difficult to absorb, but experience shows that patience and Christian understanding can solve the difficulties which arise in most of these cases. The United States has acquired a large group of loyal and able folk most of whom want to become citizens, and who are contributing substantially to the economic good of the country, beside paying income taxes which far more than cover what has been spent on them. Again we want to thank Congressman Celler, and the members of his committee for making possible the demonstration of Christian goodwill and of faith in those unfortunate people whom we have been privileged to help.

---

COPY OF LETTER DATED DECEMBER 4, 1952, FROM MR. SAMUEL L. HABER, DIRECTOR FOR GERMANY-AUSTRIA, AMERICAN JOINT DISTRIBUTION COMMITTEE TO MR. ELMER M. FALK, CHIEF, ESCAPEE PROGRAM DIVISION, RE REMARKS MADE AT MEETING WITH CONGRESSMAN CELLER ON FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28

(1) A comment was made by a spokesman of another voluntary agency concerning the difficulties of securing employment, and you will recall that Congressman Celler raised some questions concerning this point. My remarks concerned the added difficulty of Jewish displaced persons' securing employment in the German economy, and pointed out that there is a very deep-seated prejudice against employment of displaced persons in general, and especially those of the Jewish faith. I quoted, you will recall, the statement made to me by a very importantly placed Bavarian official to the effect that an employer will give employment preference in the first place to a German citizen from his own area, secondly to a German citizen, thirdly to a Volksdeutsche and finally, if at all, to a displaced person. On the basis of my experience I have no hesitation in stating that there are very few chances of securing employment for Jewish displaced persons still remaining in Camp Foehrenwald, as well as many living in communities on German welfare, which is generally supplemented by the AJDC or by a local Jewish community.

(2) I indicated the special nature of Camp Foehrenwald, the last remaining Jewish DP camp in Germany, in that it is a hard-core camp with over 50 percent of the camp inhabitants being affected by direct illness or illness of a family member. I stressed particularly the fact that there are around 700 sick people, who together with their families constitute the majority of the camp population. Among these sick people, many of whom were previously rejected for United States emigration on account of their illness, are about 350 post TB cases and

others consisting of chronically ill, old aged, and other illnesses, which previously may have been the cause of rejection. For these people there is absolutely no chance to ever find themselves in the German economy, and an act of great generosity could be effected by passage of legislation giving special consideration to these cases.

(3) You will recall that recently the American Joint Distribution Committee was able to send two hard-core transports to Norway and Sweden. These two Governments out of generosity and a spirit of humanity, thus made possible the permanent resettlement of almost 100 tuberculosis and posttuberculosis cases and their families. There has been, as you know, a tremendous outpouring of appreciation in the American press, including editorials in the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Washington Post, Kansas City Star, and many other highly regarded and respected newspapers. In the present world situation an act of American statesmanship which would open the doors to these unfortunate remnants of the post-World War II period, would be in my opinion a valuable propaganda weapon in our arsenal.

(4) Together with almost all participants in the discussion at the meeting with Congressman Celler, I on behalf of the AJDC also stressed the importance of increasing the number of 21,000 which is presently allotted in the Celler bill for displaced persons and refugees.

Mr. CELLER. Where did you get that idea, Mr. Carrigg, that we should help Spain and Sweden, Switzerland, and so forth?

Mr. CARRIGG. That matter was taken up with certain individuals in various groups and it was decided that it was a problem of refugees—

Mr. CELLER. Refugees living in those countries.

Miss THOMPSON. They are not Swedish?

Mr. CARRIGG. No; refugees.

Mr. CELLER. I will say this: I inquired very carefully when I was in Switzerland as to whether there was any refugee problem; namely, refugees as we described them in the definitions in this bill. The information I got was that there was practically no problem in Switzerland.

Mr. CARRIGG. It may be possible in several of these countries mentioned that there is no particular problem.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Walter, any questions?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Carrigg, H. R. 4842, the bill that you introduced, is the same bill that the last administration advocated, is it not?

Mr. CARRIGG. Very similar, I understand.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not the same as H. R. 2076, introduced by Mr. Celler at this Congress?

Mr. CARRIGG. There are some differences, I believe. I have not read Mr. Celler's bill, to be honest with you.

Mr. WALTER. I have a comparison here, and, your bill is practically the Truman proposal.

Mr. CELLER. What is wrong with that?

Mr. WALTER. Nothing wrong with it. The only difference between the administration bill of this administration and the last administration is that this one provides for 200,000-plus in 2 years and the last administration suggested 300,000-plus in 3 years.

Mr. CELLER. One other difference is that my bill does not provide for a "Coordinator" in the setup.

Mr. WALTER. So that, when I said this is the Truman proposal, technically I was correct.

Mr. CARRIGG. I would agree with you on that; yes.

Mr. WALTER. Let us look at these numbers. You have selected, as the number, 380,000. How did you arrive at that number, Mr. Carrigg?

Mr. CARRIGG. After talking this situation over with several people and groups who are interested in this particular type of legislation. I have prepared a justification here for these, and I will file it with the committee.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, you have broken this down to show how you arrived at each amount, each number?

Mr. CARRIGG. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. I notice it says:

not to exceed one hundred and fifty thousand visas to German expellees residing on the date of the enactment of this Act in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin, or in Austria.

That, I take it, applies to the 150,000 people born somewhere in Germany?

Mr. CARRIGG. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Are you sure that 150,000 people would want to leave Germany if this opportunity were made possible?

Mr. CARRIGG. I could not tell you that for a fact.

Mr. WALTER. If I told you that as of this minute there are 600 visa numbers available for that same class of people, would you conclude that it would be difficult to find 150,000 people who wanted to leave?

Mr. CARRIGG. Not exactly. There might be certain circumstances existing at the present time which would prevent those people from coming over.

Mr. WALTER. I have noticed people in the audience shake their head contradicting me when I said "600." I got that figure on Friday afternoon from the man in charge of the State Department's visa office, Mr. Maney; so that, as of Friday afternoon, there were 600 numbers that they did not know what to do with.

Now, then, let us, for the sake of argument, assume that that is correct. Why would people come under the provisions of your bill and not come under the provisions of existing law?

Mr. CARRIGG. I have no particular answer for that argument, Mr. Walter; but I feel that there may be circumstances existing now that would change, and perhaps a great many people would ask for admission to the United States under certain circumstances. You do not have to admit them unless you want to. They would have to meet the requirements set up by the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Mr. WALTER. The camps that I visited—and I visited most of them—were inhabited by people who expressed a desire to go back home. Their leaders without exception suggested that the United States ought to declare war on Russia so as to reclaim the land from which they had been driven out. That is the attitude of 99 percent of these people, and that, in my judgment, is the reason why there are available quota numbers that will not be used during this fiscal year.

Mr. GRAHAM. Are there other questions, gentlemen?

Mr. WALTER. I have many, but I will not ask them now. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to ask Mr. Besterman, our expert, would a national of that area between the Elbe and the Oder-Neisse Rivers come in under the German quota?

Mr. BESTERMAN. Yes, sir. That area is not officially a part of present-day Poland; it is still a part of Germany.

Mr. CARRIGG: I have here Mr. Quinn's statement on Inclusion of an Orphan Section in Emergency Immigration Legislation, submitted by the Catholic Committee for Refugees of 265 West 14th Street, New York. It says:

The Catholic Committee for Refugees located at 265 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y., is an organization operating under a charter of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C. The executive director is the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Emil N. Komora. The committee has been in existence for 16 years and its original function was to assist refugees from nazism. Subsequently it functioned in behalf of displaced persons under the President's directive. On the passage of the DP Act of 1948, it undertook work in behalf of displaced priests, displaced teachers, and displaced and war orphans.

Although we are fully in sympathy with passage of emergency immigration legislation and although it is our earnest hope that some such measure will be passed during this session of Congress, nevertheless our purpose in coming here today is solely to appeal to this committee to include some provision for orphans in whatever bill is ultimately reported out.

Communications by the hundreds have reached our office asking for European orphans, and from information which has reached us there are many such orphans facing hopeless futures who are available for emigration to the United States. The following figures in round numbers are those given us by War Relief Services, NCWC offices at Frankfurt, Salzburg, and Rome. We believe they are reliable and indicate the number of orphans in need of aid and available. Again they are orphans who would be serviced by our committee. We have no figures as to the number which would be serviced by other organizations. When we use the term "orphan" we use it as defined in sections 2 (e) and 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended. The classifications below are on the basis of location, parentage, and age.

In the German Federal Republic there are 600 DP under age of 10 and 345 German under age 10, making a total of 945. In Austria, the DP and Austrian under age 10 are 500. Italian under age 10 are 500 and Italian over age 10 are 500, making a total of 2,445. The total orphans under age 10 are 1,945 and over age 10, 500.

Of the several emergency immigration bills which we have seen it would appear that only H. R. 4824, the Carrigg bill, has provision for orphans and this in sections 2 (d) and 4 (h). We might add that in our humble opinion the two sections seem quite adequate for the purpose in mind. To be specific with reference to the aforementioned bill:

Section 2 (d):

(1) *Residence*.—This is rather more than adequate for our purpose, since the orphans of which we have knowledge reside in Germany, Austria, and Italy. However, other groups might wish the inclusion of other areas, namely, Greece. It is obvious when one bears in mind the vast upheavals and tragedies of today's Europe that orphans do not constitute an exclusive problem of any one group.

(2) *Definition*.—This is similar to that of section 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended and is of sufficient flexibility for a program of this nature.

(3) *Assurance satisfactory to the Administrator on adoption or guardianship proceedings*.—Together with carefully drawn regulations we believe this language would provide the necessary social safeguards.

(4) *Assurance on proper care*.—It seems to us that this section together with adequate regulations would cover section 212 (a) (15) of Public Law 414.

(5) *Under age 18*.—This affords the possibility of keeping together sibling groups where one or the other child may be over age 10 and it would also assist those who would come to relatives and are over 10.

Section 4 (h): Allocation of 3,500 visas for orphans. Judging from past performance under the DP Act it would appear that a figure in this amount for use over a 3-year period is realistic. Moreover we believe it important that a special allocation be made for orphans in order to avoid competition for numbers between adults and orphans. In view of the complexity of processing orphans for emigration it is quite conceivable that without such a provision inadequate numbers or none will be available for orphans in the last few months of operation.

Incidentally, the words "including adopted children" found in various bills have no applicability here since the children we have in mind have not as yet been adopted but would come here for adoption or guardianship. Again orphans falling under the Austrian or Italian quotas would face hopeless delay under our basic immigration law because of oversubscription, and reliance on future under-

subscription of the German quota would be too hazardous a proposition on which to embark upon a program of bringing such orphans to American homes within a reasonable time.

We are keenly interested in this problem and we believe the facilities for doing a socially sound job are available. Procedures are surrounded with the necessary safeguards designed for the best interests of the child and his prospective American parents and hence the national interest. Detailed case histories and documentation are made available to recognized social agencies in the several States authorized to place children for adoption, and supervision and responsibility is assumed by these local agencies. We are well aware of the reasons for the defeat of the Armstrong amendment during the debate on Public Law 414 but we humbly submit that the social techniques and skills gained by experience under section 2-(e) and section 2 (f) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 have brought forth the means to overcome these difficulties. Granted a good statute and adequate regulations and administration we feel a delicate problem of this nature can be handled properly and with substantial benefit to this country.

May we, therefore, earnestly commend for your sympathetic consideration the inclusion of an orphan provision in whatever bill you see fit to report out. Our experience with over 1,700 of these orphans, and our observation of their adjustment and assimilation in American homes has convinced us beyond the shadow of a doubt that such a program is sound. In our humble opinion previous congressional action in this respect has made possible for these orphans a future such as only this Nation can give; it has brought a little more joy to some of our American homes; and it has added a little more strength dedicated to the defense and protection of this blessed land. Over 60 of these youngsters are now members of our Armed Forces, and one of them who arrived here as an alien bearing an agency identification tag has now returned from Korea a United States citizen, wearing among other distinctions, the Purple Heart. Finally, when writing a bill, let it not be forgotten for whom it is done, when one remembers the least of our brethren.

**STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF WAR RELIEF SERVICES, NCWC**

Mr. GRAHAM. Our next witness is Monsignor Swanstrom.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you. I have been authorized to speak to you not only on behalf of War Relief Services, NCWC, of which I am the executive director, but also on behalf of our parent body, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, as well as for the 31 organizations which are members of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and the American Committee on Special Migration. These latter two organizations are composed of representatives of practically every large Catholic group and many of the nationality groups in the United States. They represent literally millions of our citizens.

All of these organizations have gone on record as being in favor of emergency immigration legislation to permit the entry of groups of people from various areas, who are sorely tried either because of economic conditions or political considerations. Some of these organizations have differences of opinion on the relative numbers or proportions that should be affected, but they all stand firm in their belief that at this time, this critical time, emergency legislation is of vital interest not only to those who will benefit by it, but also to our own United States as it relates to our foreign policy and the contribution it can make to American life and thought.

As an appendix to this statement, I would like to file a copy of a resolution passed by the 31 member organizations of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and the American Committee on Special Migration in reference to the so-called Watkins bill in the Senate, S. 1917, which substantiates the statement I have just made.

It has been my practice as executive director of War Relief Services, NCWC, to make an annual visit to the areas where these refugees, escapees, and expellees have been forced to live. I am well aware that the members of this committee also have the facts, figures, and full knowledge of the social and political implications that are involved in this problem. I do not want to take up your time by repeating them now. From my 10 years' experience in working with these peoples, may I suggest that the following groups be given consideration under any emergency legislation provisions: the refugees and escapees in Germany, Austria, and Trieste; a proportion of the surplus peoples in the economically depressed areas of Italy, Trieste, Greece, and Holland; the refugees and escapees from communism residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of NATO and in Turkey, groups mentioned by both administrations last year and this year.

It is true that we are fighting communism and the threat of communism on many fronts. We cannot hope to bring relief to every area of the world through immigration to the United States. However, if the above-mentioned groups can be assisted in some small measure through immigration, and we can help alleviate this threat we will have made an invaluable contribution toward effectively putting the lie to Soviet propaganda that the United States is only interested in its own monopolistic practice and is particularly disinterested in the fate of individual defectors of communism and other victims of misfortune.

I hear a great deal about the fears expressed in some circles concerning the difficulty in screening the recent escapees. I personally cannot understand this. It is my considered opinion that a very good job in this connection was done under the Displaced Persons Act. As a matter of fact, War Relief Services, NCWC, and its affiliated organizations placed some 150,000 persons brought here under the Displaced Persons Act.

We felt such a responsibility toward our Government to bring in the right kind of people that we accepted no applicant for immigration until he had been interviewed and certified as a good moral risk by the Catholic priest in the camp or area where he lived. I think it is very important to bring to this committee that many of these people come in groups from the same town. They have the same priest and teachers living among them who lived in the communities from which they came. And they know them pretty well. Out of my knowledge—I heard here this morning that there have been 1 or 2 instances, but to my knowledge—there have been no recorded incidents of the entrance of saboteurs or spies under the Displaced Persons Act. It is our contention that there should be no letup in the thorough investigation carried out by our official investigative agencies on any future program.

I think this is important to remember: Let us get clear whom we mean by people of German ethnic origin. We mean those who came not from Germany but rather Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and countries surrounding Germany. They are there because their parents or their grandparents were Germans, but they are not German citizens.

There are about 400,000 farm families against those expellees. Right today they were going into Canada. I was in Canada a few



days ago and saw some of these coming in—as fine a group of families as anyone would want to find. We can find out enough about them and we can find hundreds of them, thousands of these good families who would be anxious to come to the United States. They do not all want to come, it is true; some want to stay where they are or go back home; but a great many do because they see no other future for themselves.

The world is involved in an ideological struggle in which darkness and tyranny are fighting against freedom and human dignity. We, and all other people of the free nations of the world, must resolutely face the problems created by this struggle. Not the least of these is the loss of human rights, home, and country, expulsion of people, and the hopeless burden of life in economically depressed areas. Our Nation must help solve the problem of the refugee and assist with migration on the basis of our national welfare and international interests.

For the above reasons I heartily urge, in the names of millions of American citizens for whom I am speaking today, that you give your full support to the enactment of emergency legislation for immigration to assist these unfortunate people.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this resolution passed by the members of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and the American Committee on Special Migration at a joint meeting.

Mr. GRAHAM. Monsignor, the resolution which you offer will be incorporated in the record.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

#### RESOLUTION

The members of the National Catholic Resettlement Council and the American Committee on Special Migration at a joint meeting unanimously passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the severe religious and political persecution engaged in by the Communists in all the nations and areas under their cruel control and domination has caused the flight of great numbers of escapees to the free world; and

"Whereas the nations of the free world affording first asylum to these innocent victims of Red tyranny are not able to assimilate or otherwise care for all these victims of tyranny; and

"Whereas the problems caused by mass expulsions, escape, and special economic conditions relate directly to the ability of the member nations of NATO, individually and collectively, to prevent further aggression by the forces of Red tyranny; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the forces of freedom and peace, has recommended to the Congress that emergency legislation be enacted which will permit our Nation to play a vigorous and vital role in reducing these grave human problems to manageable proportions: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the undersigned organizations express their gratitude for the initiative and leadership taken by Senator Arthur Watkins in introducing S. 1917 and to Senators Wiley, Hendrickson, Dirksen, Taft, Bridges, Langer, Aiken, Ferguson, Ives, Saltonstall, Flanders, Carlson, Bennett, Bush, Payne, Young, and Smith of New Jersey for their support of this bill and pledge their constructive support for the passage of this law in the present session of Congress: And be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Eisenhower, Senator Watkins and his colleagues who have indicated support of S. 1917."

Joseph Kunst, American Aid Society; Mrs. Mida Schultz, American Banater Relief Society of Chicago; A. A. Polov, American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association; Aloysius J. Wycislo, War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Alphonsus Dietsche, Catholic Committee for Refugees; Rev. David Zrno, O. F. M., Croatian Refugee Committee; Kaarel R. Pusta, Sr.,

Estonian Aid, Inc.; ———, Gottscheer Relief Association; Rev. Andrew P. Jacobs, Hungarian Catholic League of America; Dr. Tibor Hongi, Hungarian National Council; Dr. Labru Mannile, Iuliu Maniu American Rumanian Relief Foundation, Inc.; Rev. Bernard Ambrozich, O. F. M., League of Catholic Slovenian Americans; Rev. Vincent Paoluccio, C. SS. R., Missionary Fathers of St. Charles for the Immigrants; Frances Hejl, National Alliance of Czech Catholics; William J. Gibbons, S.J., National Catholic Rural Life Conference; David P. Doyle, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Juvenal Marchisio, American Committee on Italian Migration; Rev. Joseph P. Fitzgerald, Bishops' Resettlement Committee of Chicago; Rev. William F. ———, Diocesan Resettlement Council of Brooklyn; Msgr. Francis Szubinski, American Relief for Poland; Albert J. Sattler, National Council of Catholic Men; Cyril J. Potocek, New York Diocesan Resettlement Committee; Felix T. Burant, Polish Immigration Committee, Peter Wagner, United Friends of Needy and Displaced Peoples of Yugoslavia; Alena Devenis, United Lithuanian Relief; Veturia Mannile, American Federation of International Institutes; Dr. L. Ivors, Byelorussian Congress; Mary Sullivan Spellman, National Council of Catholic Women; Winn Drudan, United Ukrainian American Relief Committee; Michael Piznak, Ukrainian Congress Committee; Rev. Victor Ready, Evangelical Reform Church, Hungarian Synod.

Mr. HILLINGS. Monsignor, the legislation before us has been recommended and suggested by various Members of Congress and others who introduced the legislation on this problem. Of course, it provides for a large number of people to be brought into this country from Italy. The question I would like to ask concerning that is somewhat premature and it would be much better to ask it tomorrow, I suppose, but unfortunately we will not be here tomorrow.

Assume that the De Gasperi government falls and does not receive a parliamentary majority as a result of the elections at the polls. Suppose that that coalition of De Gasperi which is friendly to the United States is not retained and that we have taking its place a more hostile government, perhaps with strong pro-Communist elements in it, would it still be your position that we should admit the large number of Italians to this country regardless of that?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. It would, because the present population of Italy is about 49 million at least and at best they can take care well, of, say, 40 million; they have got such a vast overpopulation there that millions, literally millions, particularly in the south of Italy, will never be able to find a decent livelihood unless they migrate some place else, not to the United States, particularly, but South America, Australia, Canada, other places that can absorb them in large numbers. But no matter what happens in Italy, I still feel for the sake of the individuals concerned that many of them will have to migrate.

Mr. WALTER. Would the gentleman yield to me at that point? The fact of the matter is we would be better off from a security standpoint if that did happen because Italians have been known to get rid of their enemies, their political enemies, and it might well be that if the left takes over in the election tomorrow, permission will be granted only to the people way on the right to leave. That is important to remember for this reason: Italy is the only Government this side of the Iron Curtain where permission must be obtained from the country in order to emigrate. Is that correct?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I honestly think that I am one of the few Americans who have spent a great deal of time in the last few years in

Reggio Calabria, Bari, Taranto, and such places. I heard it said here that if you take a few people you would be discriminating against others. I spoke to a large group there one day about 2 years ago, say, 3 or 4 thousand people. I talked about the possibility of the United States taking a few of them. A cheer went up—see, the psychological effect of it. They would be glad to see a few of their friends and relatives given an opportunity to go some place else.

But God forbid, if Italy should go communistic, you would have a wave of escapees from Italy, also. They would be known enemies of the Communists now.

Mr. CELLER. That is a hypothetical question. We have not reached that point yet.

Mr. HILLINGS. I prefaced my question with that feeling.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Walter, any questions?

Mr. WALTER. Monsignor Swanstrom, I agree with what you say about the screening that took place under the DP program. I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate you and your organization on the splendid work you did.

What you say about people knowing the priests from back behind the Iron Curtain where they came from, was that not true largely because expulsions were taking place for a good many years?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. That is true; but I know in Berlin last year I met whole groups of peoples in these little temporary refugee camps from among the escapees, all of whom came from the same place and knew each other, you see.

Here, and this is not generally known in the United States, frequently the Catholic war-relief directors from each diocese of the eastern zone of Berlin come into Berlin to meet together. The Russians somehow or other permit them to do it nowadays; they come with a certain amount of fear because it does get around, but they meet their own people there. I have gone to these little camps with them and talked with their people, you see.

Mr. WALTER. I have been in camps where the residents of an entire village were living together.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I think it is awfully important not to think of these people in terms of saboteurs, spies, and Communists who are anxious to destroy the United States. The vast majority of them are good people like I think we are ourselves. We are only looking for a decent livelihood, the vast majority.

Mr. WALTER. Let me point out to you the part in the Potsdam agreement about the expulsions in what was called "in orderly and humane manner." That language was after Mr. Truman and the British have decided to try to salvage something because as of the time of the Potsdam agreement people by the thousands have been expelled from their homeland. Was that not true?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Mr. Walter, you were in Berlin in 1945?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. "Orderly and humane manner"—I think about two million people died in that expulsion.

Mr. WALTER. They came in box cars, like cattle.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I saw them die on the station floor. It was denied, of course, someplace but I saw it with my own eyes. Perhaps it was "orderly and humane" in some degree but a great many people suffered tragedy.

Mr. WALTER. When did the expulsion start?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. It really began before Potsdam. I looked into it very carefully. It started in 1944.

Mr. WALTER. I read your book with great interest.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I followed that. Potsdam put the stamp of approval on a very unfortunate incident in history.

Mr. WALTER. But the expulsions started in 1944. That was before Potsdam.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Definitely.

Mr. WALTER. Potsdam was designed to try to salvage something.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. I was there for 6 months with others and watched the movement of these people.

Another thing I would like to bring out here is that Poland had a population of about 30 million people. We have spent nearly a month in Poland before the Iron Curtain had come down completely. Less than 5 percent of the people are really part and parcel of the party in Government.

Look at the millions you have there. Only a few can escape, a few very strong, brave ones escape. The same is true in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. You still have millions of people who are going to fight and are opposed to communism. By and large, they have not been escaping, except when a whole flock of them have to escape together.

So we have got plenty of people there to keep a Communist battle going there.

Mr. WALTER. How do you think the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Code protect us? Are they adequate to protect our security?

Incidentally, your organization endorsed that code, did it not?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. The National Catholic Welfare Conference endorsed that code, yes.

Mr. WALTER. There were charges that the law was anti-Catholic or anti-Semitic. Now I get the firm admission that your organization endorsed it.

Mr. CELLER. Has your organization come out for an amendment to the code?

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Our organization has come out strongly for amendments, and I would like to put on the record then that—

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interject? Let us not get into that. We are hearing this specific thing today and we would not like to get the issues crossed. I do not want to shut you off but we do have another witness with us and we have only 15 minutes left.

Monsignor SWANSTROM. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully ask the same thing that Mr. Carrigg did, that the Catholic Committee be given an opportunity sometime later to testify on the orphan part of the bill. Mr. Quinn is prepared to testify on that.

Mr. CELLER. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I just want to put some information in the record about Italy, and particularly a letter from our former Ambassador to Italy concerning the Italian birth rate. The letter gives clear evidence of the fact that the Italian birth rate is far less than our own.

Then there is a communication, part of a communication from the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to our Ambassador Draper concerning the efforts made by the Italian Emigration Service to widely scatter their emigrants all over the world.

There is some very interesting data as to the success of that operation.

I would like to put those in the record.

(The letters and data referred to follow:)

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
AMERICAN EMBASSY,  
Rome, November 26, 1952.

CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is strange how hard it is to get it out of people's heads that the Italians multiply at an abnormal rate. You are quite correct that we informed you that the Italian birthrate is less than that in the United States and France. It is much less than in the Netherlands. Comparative statistics back to 1940 are given on the attached sheet. I have taken these from the United Nations publications, not only because that is a reliable source but because it is readily available to anybody who has doubts.

If the gentlemen of the press are going to think and write about these things, they should have a correct picture of the fundamental situation and trends as shown in the attached.

The highest birth rate in Italy was in the early eighties, at 38 per thousand of population. From that point it declined steadily to the 17.9 in 1952, with the pattern broken only by lower levels in the two world war periods. (It is interesting that United States figures from 1940 to 1950 almost exactly changed places with the Italian figures for 1940-52.) The low French figures for 1940-45 are probably also due to the war, with the 1946-51 figures representing a more normal trend.

These figures prove not only that the French birthrate has exceeded the Italian for about 3 years and the American for about 8, but that the Italian trend is a definite one and downward, so that the comparison now may be considered firm and not due to some temporary abnormal condition.

I enjoyed meeting you in Rome, and can assure you that we all profited from your visit. If we can be of any service in your work and projects which are of great importance—especially in these times—please do not hesitate to call on us.

With cordial regards to Mrs. Celler, I am

Yours very sincerely,

CARLISLE C. McIVOR.

*Live birthrate figures for France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and the United States from 1940 to 1951*<sup>1</sup>

[Per thousand of population]

	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
France.....	14.0	13.4	14.8	15.9	16.4	16.4	20.9	21.3	21.2	21.0	20.5	19.4
Germany.....	20.0	18.6	15.0	16.0					16.6	16.8	16.2	15.7
Italy.....	23.5	20.9	20.5	20.0	19.4	18.5	22.7	21.9	21.6	20.0	19.6	18.1
Netherlands.....	20.8	20.3	21.0	23.0	24.0	22.6	30.2	27.8	25.3	23.7	22.7	22.3
United States.....	17.9	18.9	20.9	21.5	20.2	19.6	23.3	25.7	24.1	24.0	23.5	24.5

<sup>1</sup> From United Nations Statistical Yearbook 1949-50 and United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, October 1952.

<sup>2</sup> The Italian birthrate for the first 9 months of 1952 was at 17.9 per 1,000 per annum. The British birthrate in 1951 was 15.9, but this represents a sudden drop in the last 3 or 4 years and the normal rate would probably be in the neighborhood of the present Italian birth rate.

*Live birthrate figures for Italy,<sup>1</sup> 1872-1940*

[Per thousand of population]

	Rate		Rate		Rate
1872-75.....	36.8	1896-1900.....	34.0	1921-25.....	29.8
1876-80.....	36.9	1900-05.....	32.7	1926-30.....	26.8
1881-85.....	38.0	1906-10.....	32.7	1931-35.....	23.8
1886-90.....	37.5	1911-15.....	31.5	1936-40.....	23.3
1891-95.....	36.0	1916-20.....	23.0		

<sup>1</sup> Italian Central Bureau of Statistics.

## EXCERPT OF A LETTER FROM DOMINEDO TO AMBASSADOR DRAPER

\* \* \* I have advised President de Gasperi of your realistic views on the general problem of the surplus of population. He instructs me to convey to you his sincere appreciation.

As I mentioned in the course of our conversation, Italy suffers at present from an excess of population due to the curtailment of emigration during the war and immediate postwar years. In order to remedy such a state of affairs in a reasonable lapse of time, it has been theoretically estimated that it would be necessary to achieve a rate of 450-500,000 migrants a year bearing in mind that an active policy on the part of the Italian Government has roughly assured and maintained opportunities of employment for the 200,000 new working units thrown each year on the labor market.

While it is obvious that the aforesaid figure represents in these circumstances an unattainable maximum, it would already be a very important improvement if the present migrating average of 150,000 units a year (160,000 in the last one) be increased to 250,000, while Italy would undertake on the other hand to raise to the same figure opportunities for employment inside the country.

The Italian Government will naturally make every effort to develop plans for internal employment. However, in order to increase the rate of emigration by 100,000 units a year, it must rely on the understanding and practical cooperation of friendly countries, and in the first place of the United States of America, in order to obtain that new outlets be found abroad for Italian labor.

I wish to state, on behalf of the Italian Government, that Italy is willing to explore every avenue which may lead to this end, both through integration of soil, labor, and capital (national and international), as well as through the development and strengthening of the proper international organization (CIPME) the increase of technical assistance, etc. Any aid on the part of other countries would of course provoke a corresponding contribution on the part of Italy.

I believe the gravity of the Italian problem amply justifies my drawing your personal attention to the necessity of finding some outlet for the surplus Italian population. It is a problem which I strongly feel should be viewed in the Atlantic framework, both as a valuable source of labor to be employed according to the principle of the "joint resources" and as potential element of unrest to be eliminated in a country called upon and willing to play its role in the common defense of the free world.

(Signed) DOMINEDO,  
*Il Sottosegretario di Stato per gli Affari Esteri.*

ROME, July 30, 1952.

## ANNEX I TO THE ITALIAN MEMORANDUM ON MANPOWER SURPLUS IN ITALY

*Italian emigration to different countries since 1946*

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
<b>Italian overseas emigration:</b>						
Canada.....	-1	18	2,353	5,915	6,975	21,315
United States of America.....	4,481	20,207	11,892	8,278	4,927	6,565
Central America.....	-8	201	170	167	115	139
Argentina.....	337	24,416	64,698	90,806	63,225	42,143
Brazil.....	-20	2,995	3,196	5,582	6,205	7,059
Bolivia.....	-1	32	105			44
Colombia.....	-1	86	88	129	57	222
Chile.....	-4	480	707	339	57	254
Peru.....	-19	308	615	677	283	245
Venezuela.....	68	2,240	8,022	13,767	13,795	8,179
Uruguay.....	-9	320	1,303	2,257	1,814	1,715
Other countries of South America.....	4	89	61	73	55	57
Eritrea.....	-2	-212	-615	-1,110	-485	-440
Somalia.....		166	-249	119	383	158
Kenya.....		2	932	31	77	78
Other countries of Africa.....	-4	30	746	380	663	1,087
Countries of Asia.....	-15	21	10	-63	-35	524
Australia.....	2	47	1,743	10,746	13,253	17,168
Other countries of Oceania.....	2	2	-4	6	-2	14
	4,894	51,660	96,641	138,972	111,901	106,969
	-84	-212	-868	-1,173	-522	-440
	4,810	51,448	95,773	137,799	111,385	106,529
<b>Italian emigration to Europe:</b>						
Belgium.....	8,241	15,585	23,701	5,110	138	23,851
France.....	28,000	48,956	38,672	47,911	11,165	19,090
United Kingdom.....	1,550	252	2,656	6,575	8,362	8,989
Austria.....	847	246	363			
Luxembourg.....			346	19	566	1,423
Netherlands.....			166	531	105	27
Sweden.....		805	594			418
Continental European countries.....	3	-229	-175	-219	-361	-113
Mediterranean Countries.....	-53	361	1,924	93	418	362
	38,588	65,976	68,247	60,020	20,393	54,047
<b>Seasonal workers to Europe:</b>						
Switzerland.....		105,117	139,271	88,167	88,369	128,268
France.....		3,243	1,529	3,345	4,781	13,289
Austria.....						300
		-108,360	140,800	91,512	93,150	141,857

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to put in the record a comparison, a chart showing the comparison of all the bills.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may be done.

(The chart referred to is as follows:)

*General comparison of pending refugee, expellee, etc., bills, including committee print*

	Com- mittee print <sup>1</sup> (2-years)	H. R. 2076 (3-years)	H. R. 4842 (3-years)	H. R. 1707 <sup>1</sup> (3-years)	H. R. 3845 (3-years)	H. R. 4925 <sup>1</sup> (2-years)
Number to be admitted.....	240,000	328,000	380,000	300,000	328,000	240,000
Numbers by classes:						
German expellees (residing in West- ern Berlin, German Republic, or Austria).....	110,000	100,000	150,000	117,000	100,000	125,000
Escapees (residence as above).....						
Italians (residing in Italy or Trieste).....	75,000	64,000	50,000	21,000	64,000	10,000
Greeks (residing in Greece).....	20,000	100,000	100,000	117,000	100,000	75,000
Netherlanders (residing in metropol- itan area).....	20,000	22,000	25,000	22,500	22,000	15,000
Escapees (residing in Trieste, Tur- key, or NATO countries—not na- tionals of area of residence).....	15,000	22,000	25,000	22,500	22,000	15,000
Classes in H. R. 4842 not in other bills:						
China refugees.....			1,500	( <sup>1</sup> )	20,000	( <sup>1</sup> )
Orphans, Western Europe.....			3,500			

<sup>1</sup> Provides for administration under a coordinator or commission.

NOTE.—Miscellaneous: H. R. 4044, H. R. 3201, H. R. 2991 for 25,000 nationals of Netherlands, 1 year period; H. J. Res. 178, 50,000 natives of Netherlands, 1 year period; H. R. 4935, 240,000 immigrants as prescribed by President, 2 year period; H. R. 361, 50,000 Italians, 5 year-period; H. R. 5001, Office of Commissioner of Refugees.

## STATEMENT OF DR. PAUL C. EMPIE, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

MR. GRAHAM. Dr. Empie, before you start, the bell rings at a quarter to twelve. There is very important legislation on the floor. Will you go as far as you can?

DR. EMPIE. With your permission, I will attempt to paraphrase the paragraphs that appear before you to save time and to avoid as much repetition as possible.

Dr. Clarence E. Krumbholz, director of the department of welfare of the National Lutheran Council, is not with me but this is Dr. Roland Elliott, director of the immigration services of Church World Service which is a department of the National Council of Churches.

I also should like to add that I am speaking also for the social welfare department of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, which makes my testimony inclusive of practically all of the 7 million Lutherans in the United States, as well as those Protestants in the 34 million of the National Council of Churches.

The third paragraph of my statement speaks for itself, I think, and in the faint hope that it will be read, I shall skip it. It gives the motivation of our testimony.

The fourth paragraph refers to the fact that we rejoiced at President Eisenhower's message on this subject and are heartily in back of it. We do not presume to speak for every individual in our churches but think we represent by far the majority of them.

The next two paragraphs, Mr. Chairman, have to do with the fact that we are authorized to speak only in behalf of legislation affecting refugees. Our organizations all have taken a point of view that it is an abnormal situation that we confront in regard to the refugees and that that calls for emergency legislation. We cannot in good conscience ask for emergency legislation to take care of surplus popu-



lations which we feel is a normal situation that ought to be cared for in permanent immigration laws of our country.

We do want to emphasize, however, we think the surplus population problem is an important one and when the time comes to discuss and study that we are ready, heartily, to endorse and support it to the extent of our ability.

That takes me down to the middle of page 2, sir. The third paragraph there defines the term "refugee" upon which we wish to testify, and perhaps I ought to read that.

We use the term "refugees" to include those people who have been uprooted from their homes by war and the aftermath of war and who are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation to countries of opportunity: The German expellees residing in Western Germany and Austria; the escapees from Iron Curtain countries; non-Communists who have fled Communist China and Manchuria, and European refugees in the Middle East and elsewhere. We believe legislation should be enacted to permit the entrance into the United States, on a nonquota basis, of a specified number of these persons. The number proposed by the President, 240,000 in the next 2 years, seems to us to be a fair, just, and practicable contribution by the United States to the solution of the refugee problem. Early action by the Congress along these lines would receive, in our view, the overwhelming support of the people of our churches.

Our point is that if refugees to this number should be taken from the countries where surplus population problems exist, indirectly it would affect and relieve the surplus population problem.

I have here statements, one from the leader of the Greek group who makes a statement to that effect, saying, in part:

I have noted recently your President's message calling for what he well called emergency legislation to enable 240,000 refugees and others in special need to emigrate to the United States of America. This would be a great act of generous help to us since the present American quota is far too small to meet our present needs.

In my judgment, as I told you, the very best way to help Greece through this special legislation proposed by your President would be to include as many visas as possible for Greek refugees and repatriates now resident in Greece. These persons naturally constitute the most serious aspect of our population problems and include some of our best families and workers.

That is signed, "Hamilcar S. Alivisatos, General Secretary."

Also, there is a cablegram from Mr. Chandler in which he says:

Conference highest Italian authorities indicates satisfaction all refugee bill provided include former colonists foreign refugees Venezia Guiliens totaling same figure Watkins bill.

So that our figure, sir, is restricted to refugees at this point. But we believe that it will indirectly help the surplus population problem in Italy and Greece in particular.

Mr. CELLER. You did not ask direct aid with reference to your surplus population?

Dr. EMPIE. No, sir.

Mr. CELLER. You simply say that you give indirect aid in that regard by siphoning off some of the refugees.

Dr. EMPIE. Yes, sir.

The last paragraph on page 2 has to do with H. R. 5001 which we think helps to consolidate and make more effective the program of the United States for refugees, for it might well be combined in its con-

tent and its administrative provisions with the proposed Emergency Migration Act of 1953 now under consideration. Thus the Congress would be dealing in an effective, unified way with the total refugee problem.

Then on page three, sir, I would like to make this comment about the first paragraph. We have never taken the point of view that this legislation should be used to encourage people to flee from behind the Iron Curtain. In my own opinion, that would be a grave mistake. It seems to us that there is an extensive underground of anti-Communist forces behind the Iron Curtain. I am particularly familiar with East Germany. Our churches have never recognized the Iron Curtain as a matter of fact as a divided or dividing line of any kind. Our bishops and our pastors in many of the churches administer their work on both sides of the line and refuse to recognize a divided church. I know when pastors have asked leave to come to Western Germany their bishops have said to them, "Don't leave; stay where you are. You must stay with your people and suffer with them, and if necessary die with them. You must be the leaders."

The same thing has been said also of the leaders of the youth movements that are special targets of Communist attack. However, it happens that at times the activities of those who are stalwart resisters to communism become apparent to public notice and their position is no longer tenable. They have a choice: Either to leave or to go to the uranium mines in Silesia or somewhere in Siberia. At this point, when a man's usefulness comes to an end, whether it is in the youth movement or one of the youth leaders, he has no recourse but to flee, and they are fleeing in substantial numbers.

The same thing is true of those who through collectivization or other policies of communism lose their farms or their properties and cannot sustain life, they cannot get ration cards, they cannot work, they are known, they are marked, and they are no longer useful. As a matter of fact, they are a hindrance in the fight against communism. Therefore, they must leave.

I also want to underscore what has been said by Monsignor Swannstrom, that our leaders are thoroughly in touch, constantly, with the fight behind the Iron Curtain, and are in a position to give competent and reliable information about those whom our agency would screen, as I am sure is true of those whom the Catholic agencies would screen. I think that is important. I would not like to have it said from our point of view this is to encourage people to flee but it is to give them the knowledge that if in their battle they have made a move that exposes them to immediate reprisal, they do have friends who will welcome them. That gives them, I think, morale. It builds up their hope to know that they have partners and allies in this war against communism.

Naturally, only a small part can leave and come to the United States. Our agencies, the World Council of Churches and the Lutheran World Federation, have helped refugees to go to other countries in far larger numbers than they have helped them to come to the United States. Nearly three times as many have gone to other countries. That is, I think, almost as true in connection with the World Council of Churches, and we do not look at it from the point of view only of the United States interest. We look at it from the point of view of a global perspective; but we have found in our con-

tacts abroad that the United States dramatizes for these people freedom; it dramatizes for them resistance, and to know that we are willing to stand side by side and take a fair, proper share of those who cannot be assimilated into Western Europe would be in our point of view a very constructive thing. I would like to enlarge on that but there is no time.

Now, sir, if we can go down in page 3 to the bottom of the page, we are reluctant to make recommendations as to the categories of the number of refugees in each of these categories that should be included. No official action has been taken by our churches on this specific matter. However, for such value as it may have, we append here a suggested table of categories of refugees for the guidance of the committee, and that table is appended based on the present experience of our agencies and our religious, welfare, and migration programs among each of these groups of refugees and represents our appraisal in approximate numerical terms of the following factors:

1. Individual and family needs.
2. Possibility of local assimilation.
3. Number of friends and relatives in the United States of America.
4. Alternative possibilities of migration.
5. Imminent danger to life.
6. Possibility of eliminating this aspect of the refugee problem.

Naturally we believe the Congress will wish to deal with these categories of people on the basis of need and without regard to sectarian, racial, or geographical considerations.

The paragraph on the top of page 4 is simply a repetition of our position in regard to keeping our contact with people throughout our churches behind the Iron Curtain.

Lastly, sir, there are certain questions of administrative procedure which at your convenience we would be glad to discuss with your committee, such as:

1. We believe that the attempt in the DP program to match persons and jobs overseas was largely responsible for the instability of many placements and that in a new program this should be and can be corrected.

2. We believe that by careful placement plans and by adequate governmental financial provisions a better geographical distribution of immigrants can be secured as between seaboard areas and the Central and Western States.

Finally, if we can do this sooner, that is that much better.

Mr. CELLER. If you exclude the principle of siphoning off surplus populations then you would exclude, I take it, any relief unless there is some refugee there?

Dr. EMPIE. Only insofar as such refugees may be present, sir.

Mr. CELLER. You mention Italian returnees, I think, on page 2. If they are refugees under your definition in Italy, well and good; but how many so-called Italian returnees would there be?

Dr. EMPIE. On the table, sir, the final exhibit, the estimate is that there are at least half a million there, that 200,000 need to migrate, and the suggested amount is 35,000. That might be altered, of course.

Mr. CELLER. The definition of Italian returnees—I said, Italian returnees.

Dr. EMPIE. That is correct. Subdivision (c), last page, Italian returnees and expellees.

Mr. CELLER. Exactly what is meant by "Italian returnee" or "expellee"?

Dr. EMPIE. People who have been expelled from North Africa would be included in that group, in former Italian colonies; and there are a large number of them.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, you would give preference; you would exclude those who would have been nationals of Italy unless they would be returnees or expellees, is that it?

Dr. EMPIE. That is our thought, sir, that emergency legislation should confine itself to refugees.

Mr. CELLER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to ask a question if I may, at this point.

In your statement on page 2, the last paragraph, you state the number proposed is 240,000, and so on, the solution to the refugee problem. But the bill before us provides only 110,000 dealing with the refugee problem. So you would up that to 240,000 and then forget about Italians, Greeks, Dutch, and the escapees, would you not?

Dr. EMPIE. Not the escapees, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Those residing in Trieste and Turkey, and so on.

Dr. EMPIE. In other words, we support the legislation insofar as it applies to refugees.

Mr. WALTER. If I understand your statement correctly, you have 240,000 to cover.

Mr. GRAHAM. The time has come to adjourn, I may say first, however, that Dr. Empie's statement, including the table may appear in full in the record.

(The statements and tables referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL RESPECTING THE EMERGENCY MIGRATION ACT OF 1953

My name is Paul C. Empie of New York City. I am the executive director of the National Lutheran Council in the United States of America. I appear before you by authorization not only of the National Lutheran Council but also of the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America. With me are Clarence E. Krumbholz, director of the department of welfare of the National Lutheran Council and Roland Elliott, director of immigration services of Church World Service which is a department of the National Council of Churches.

The National Council of Churches is comprised of 30 Protestant and Orthodox communions having a total membership of more than 34,000,000. The National Lutheran Council represents eight participating bodies of the Lutheran Church in this country. While, obviously, we cannot speak for each of the members of these churches, we can assure you that there is strong support among these churches for emergency legislation for the relief of refugees.

The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, in session in Denver in December 1952, expressed its sympathy and concern respecting the plight of the millions of uprooted people who cannot return to their own countries and who are unable to find homes and work in the countries of their refuge. This situation was described as "tragic with suffering for the individual," and as "an important factor in the worldwide unrest." The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches then called for "immediate special legislation to permit and assist our fair share of the refugees to enter the United States for permanent residence." The executive committee of the National Lutheran Council, on March 25, 1953, voted unanimously in support of emergency legislation for refugees.

In view of these actions the people of our churches rejoiced when, on April 22, 1953, President Eisenhower called for such legislation. The general board of the National Council of Churches in session in Chicago, May 20, 1953, took note of President Eisenhower's request and, without a dissenting vote, recommended that

Congress approve such legislation at the earliest possible moment. There are similar expressions of approval of the President's action by the leaders of the National Lutheran Council.

In carrying out the recommendations of the President, we feel sure the Congress will wish to make certain that the 240,000 visas proposed are used in a way that will achieve the most effective and strategic results in terms of the urgent objectives the President has stated so clearly. There is a growing recognition that 240,000 visas spread over the combined problems of surplus populations and refugees will not vitally affect either problem—whereas 240,000 visas utilized for refugees and escapees can, in fact, provide the impetus to a real solution of many of the most difficult concentrations of the refugee problem—and thus indirectly constitute an effective and strategic contribution to the problem of overpopulation. It is obvious that to include repatriates and returnees in Greece and Italy in a refugee bill would constitute real relief to the overpopulation problems in these countries. Such provision on a fair basis, proportionate to the number of refugees involved, we would strongly advocate.

It is our judgment that the problems of overpopulation are so vast, so complicated, and so dependent for their solution upon the adoption by the countries concerned of long range programs of political-economic-social improvement (e. g., as in Italy at the present time) that it would be mistaken policy to give the impression at home or abroad that these problems can be resolved by immigration to the United States—especially would it be misleading to suggest that the inconsequential number of visas available within a total of 240,000 could make any real impression on an overpopulation problem involving many millions of persons. At the same time, we would stress strongly that the United States should continue to take the lead, through the United Nations and otherwise, in initiating and supporting intergovernmental programs designed to assist countries of overpopulation in the progressive solution of these urgently important population problems so crucially related to the cause of world peace. We wish to reemphasize our conviction that such action by the United States Congress re overpopulation problems is crucially important but that the overpopulation problem is one requiring further study in the light of our own permanent immigration policies; it is a problem which cannot be solved by emergency legislation.

We use the term "refugees" to include those people who have been uprooted from their homes by war and the aftermath of war and who are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation to countries of opportunity: the German expellees residing in Western Germany and Austria; the Italian returnees, the Greek expellees now residing in Greece; the escapees from Iron Curtain countries; non-Communists who have fled Communist China and Manchuria and European refugees in the Middle East and elsewhere. We believe legislation should be enacted to permit the entrance into the United States, on a nonquota basis, of a specified number of these persons. The number proposed by the President, 240,000 in the next 2 years, seems to us to be a fair, just, and practicable contribution by the United States to the solution of the refugee problem. Early action by the Congress along these lines would receive, in our view, the overwhelming support of the people of our churches.

In this connection we would stress the importance also of H. R. 5001 introduced by your chairman. That bill (and S. 1766), which would consolidate and make more effective the program of the United States, for refugees, in our judgment, might well be combined in its content and its administrative provisions with the proposed Emergency Migration Act of 1953 now under consideration. Thus the Congress would be dealing in an effective, unified way with the total refugee problem, and contributing most substantially to its solution while postponing for fuller consideration, the more complex aspects of the overpopulation problem.

We believe such action would vastly increase the moral and spiritual stature of the United States. By admitting its fair share of these homeless and destitute persons the United States would stand before the world as the deliverer of the oppressed and the defender of those who, at the risk of their lives, have sought release from the bondage of Communist oppression. Such action would invest our foreign policy with the quality of mercy and correct the mis-impression of those who believe the United States is indifferent to the plight of these helpless people.

The National Council of Churches and the National Lutheran Council believe the refugee problem, tragic enough in itself, is contributing to the worldwide unrest by which our own peace and security are threatened. Accordingly, by helping the refugees we help ourselves. By defending the right of the refugees to life and liberty we earn for ourselves the respect of the freedom loving nations

of the earth. Our security is thereby enhanced since our defense is more than a matter of guns, bombs, and armed forces. We need and must have the goodwill and sympathetic understanding of the free peoples of the world. The enactment of refugee legislation would strengthen the bonds of friendship between ourselves and those nations which stand with us in resisting the advance of Communist aggression.

We would ask your committee to note that our church agencies, in addition to cooperating in the resettlement in the United States of some 100,000 persons under the DP program, are also equally active through our own church world organizations in plans for resettlement in other countries. So far, our church agencies have resettled much greater numbers of refugees elsewhere in the world. Therefore, our perspective on this total problem is a global one.

We are reluctant to make recommendations as to the categories and the number of refugees in each of these categories that should be included in the pending legislation. No official action has been taken by our churches on this specific matter. However, for such value as it may have, we append herewith a suggested table of categories of refugees for the guidance of the committee. This table (appended) is based on the present experience of our agencies in their religious, welfare, and migration programs among each of these groups of refugees and represents our appraisal in approximate numerical terms of the following factors:

1. Individual and family needs;
2. Possibility of local assimilation;
3. Number of friends and relatives in the United States;
4. Alternative possibilities of migration;
5. Imminent danger to life;
6. Possibility of eliminating this aspect of the refugee problem.

Naturally we believe the Congress will wish to deal with these categories of people on the basis of need and without regard to sectarian, racial, or geographical considerations.

We, of course, are conscious of the importance of our own national security in any such program. We would recommend the adoption of thorough screening procedures, administered by United States officials of known integrity and human understanding. Our own experience in the DP program (in which we have resettled in the United States hundreds of Moslems and Buddhists as well as approximately 100,000 Protestant and Orthodox Christians) and our day-to-day contact with the refugees and escapees proposed for inclusion in the present program, reassure us that such security screening is possible. The Christian work of our churches to assist these people is in fact also guided by security objectives: our policy for the recommendation of people for immigration to the United States is always to include only those persons whose good character and acceptability for United States citizenship would be attested to by their fellow church members, their pastors, and others who know their past history as well as their present situation. In each of these presently proposed categories of refugees and escapees, we believe that adequate safeguards to our security are possible and practicable.

There are certain questions of administrative procedure which at your convenience we would be glad to discuss with your committee, e. g.:

1. We believe that the attempt in the DP program to match persons and jobs overseas was largely responsible for the instability of many placements and that in a new program this should be and can be corrected.
2. We believe that by careful placement plans and by adequate governmental financial provisions a better geographical distribution of immigrants can be secured as between seaboard areas and the Central and Western States.

A final note of urgency: If enabling legislation can be enacted in the present session of the Congress, the program can begin to be operative—with relief and new hope to these people—before the next winter brings new hardships to them. We earnestly hope this may be possible.

#### APPENDIX TO THE STATEMENT OF CHURCH WORLD SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the National Lutheran Council believe the following categories of refugees should be included in special emergency legislation; the numbers in the third column are approximate only, but are suggestive.

*NCC-NLC working table on emergency legislation*

	Total	Need to migrate somewhere	Fair share to United States
(a) Pipeline cases at conclusion of DP program:			
(1) IRO DP's .....	180,000	100,000	12,000
(2) German expellees .....	(8,500,000)	35,000	20,000
(b) German expellees .....	8,500,000	1,200,000	90,000
(c) Italian returnees and expellees .....	500,000	200,000	35,000
(d) Greek returnees and expellees .....	174,000	75,000	15,000
(e) Neo-refugees from Iron Curtain countries and East Zone of Germany .....	2,000,000	200,000	35,000
(f) Refugees residing in NATO and other countries of the free world .....	200,000	50,000	20,000
(g) European refugees in the Middle East .....	6,000	6,000	2,000
(h) Refugees from China and Manchuria:			
(1) European refugees .....	25,000	20,000	5,000
(2) Chinese intellectuals .....	1,500,000	100,000	5,000
(i) Orphans .....	(?)	(?)	1,000
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>13,085,000</b>	<b>1,986,000</b>	<b>240,000</b>

Mr. GRAHAM. The hearing will be continued tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in this room.

(Whereupon, at 11:50 a. m., the hearing was continued to 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 9, 1953.)





# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

---

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Hon. Louis E. Graham presiding.

Present: Representatives Reed (chairman), Graham (chairman of the subcommittee), Thompson, Hillings, Celler, and Walter.

Also present: Walter M. Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee will come to order.

Before we hear from Mr. Javits, I would like to place in the record the statement of Walter J. Mason, member of the National Legislative Committee of the American Federation of Labor; statements of the Tolstoy Foundation of New York City; a letter from Walter P. Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and letters addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee from the National Council of the Churches of Christ, the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation, from the Order Sons of Italy in America of Washington, D. C., and Chicago, Ill., and from the Massachusetts Baptist Convention of Boston, Mass.

(The matters referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF WALTER J. MASON, MEMBER, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, ON THE EMERGENCY MIGRATION ACT OF 1953

The American Federation of Labor supports the purposes of the proposed Emergency Migration Act of 1953 which would authorize the immigration of an additional 240,000 persons from Europe during a period of 2 years. This legislation would make a fundamental contribution to the all-important struggle of the free world against Communist tyranny. Its enactment would give new hope and faith to the hundreds of thousands of refugees from Communist terror and enslavement.

The American Federation of Labor was one of the champions of the Displaced Persons Acts of 1949 and 1950 because we believed they were necessary to meet the emergency problems resulting from persecution by totalitarian regimes. In the light of experience under that legislation, we are convinced that our support of the displaced persons program was fully justified. Now we have a new problem and a new emergency—the problem of the millions of people who have fled into Western Europe from the Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain. The committee print which your committee is now considering will help to meet some of the problems which have resulted from this new emergency.

Since the war there has been a steady stream of refugees who have managed to break out from behind the Iron Curtain despite every means that their Communist rulers have adopted to prevent them from fleeing from Communist enslavement. Large numbers of individuals have, at the risk of their lives, escaped from Communist tyranny to gain freedom in Western Europe. But the presence of these large numbers of refugees in Western Europe has created serious prob-

lems in a number of areas which are already overburdened with a surplus population.

The American Federation of Labor recognizes that the United States cannot alone provide the answer to this serious problem. Our organization has supported the initiative which the United States has taken in setting up international machinery to encourage migration of surplus population. Major reliance must be placed on these international programs. But the United States has a responsibility to carry its share of the load as well as to initiate and support international efforts to deal with the problem.

The displaced persons program constituted an important beginning in the effort to provide a solution to the problems of surplus population in Western Europe arising after the war. Other nations, especially Australia, Canada, and some of the South American countries have made their contribution to a solution of this very difficult problem by admitting hundreds of thousands of immigrants from Western Europe. Since the war Canada and Australia have encouraged immigration and have each admitted about 800,000 while several hundred thousand additional persons have found a haven in South America.

But the problem is still with us, and there are still hundreds of thousands of escapees and expellees who have come into Western Europe from behind the Iron Curtain who cannot be absorbed into the already overburdened economy of the free nations of Western Europe. To their numbers, new thousands are being added all the time as additional people flee from Eastern Europe. Therefore it is essential that this legislation be enacted at this time in order for us to absorb into this country at least a fraction of this large group of people who, after having escaped into Western Europe, are unable to find a means of providing even a minimum level of living for themselves and their families.

I can assure the members of this committee that the American Federation of Labor would not recommend the enactment of this legislation if we thought that it would be harmful to the welfare of the people of the United States. We are convinced that this legislation would have no bad effects on our own country. On the contrary, while helping to achieve very desirable humanitarian goals, it will be of substantial benefit to our Nation.

The experience that we have had under the Displaced Persons Act fully supports that expectation. The immigrants who have come into this country under the displaced persons program have made a substantial contribution to America. We have every reason to believe that the admission of anti-Communist refugees as authorized under this legislation, would also be of benefit to the United States. There is no question that we can absorb into this country the 240,000 persons whose admission would be authorized by the proposed legislation.

The committee print establishes a special quota of 240,000 visas which may be, but is not required to be, distributed to refugees from certain specified key areas. These are the areas which have been hardest hit by problems of surplus population resulting from the migration of escapees and expellees from behind the Iron Curtain.

The committee print would permit a maximum of 110,000 persons to be admitted who have escaped or been expelled from Eastern Europe and are now residing in the German Federal Republic, in the western sectors of Berlin, or in Austria. The story of the sacrifices which have been made by the thousands of individuals and families who have escaped from Eastern Germany, from the satellite countries and even from Russia itself into Western Germany and the western sector of Berlin have become almost legendary. Since 1945, 10 million such persons have somehow managed to escape from Communist enslavement to freedom in Western Germany. In recent months 30,000 to 40,000 persons have been coming each month from behind the Iron Curtain into Western Germany. The presence of this very large number of refugees, whose ranks are being swelled each day, has created extremely serious economic problems in Western Germany. The admission of 110,000 refugees from Western Germany would help to alleviate the economic pressure of this swelling surplus of population on Western Germany. It would also provide an opportunity to obtain an adequate livelihood for the refugees who would come to our shores—an opportunity which, with the utmost goodwill and maximum effort, Western Germany simply cannot provide.

The committee print would provide for admission of 75,000 Italian nationals or persons of Italian ethnic origin residing in Italy or in the Free Territory of Trieste. Italy faces an exceptionally serious problem of overpopulation. The high birthrate maintained in the past and the stopping of the historic flow of

emigration during and after the war has resulted in a large increase in the Italian population. With a lower birthrate and some migration from the country, it is to be hoped that this problem will be solved in time. But at the present time there are over 2 million workers in Italy who are totally unemployed and an equal number of those employed only part time. The admission of 75,000 Italians would have at least some effect in mitigating this situation.

The committee print also provides for admission of 20,000 persons from Greece where there is also a serious unemployment problem. This key country is weathering a serious economic crisis, with industrial unemployment alone more than doubling since January 1952. This problem has been aggravated by the attempt to absorb refugees who have sought refuge in Greece from the Communist satellite countries in the Balkan area.

The Netherlands, which was already faced with a critical problem of unemployment and surplus population, has now been beset with additional problems by the recent flood. The population problems of the Netherlands arose mainly after the war when many Dutch returned to the Netherlands from the East Indies. The establishment of the independent Republic of Indonesia also created special economic problems for the Netherlands which have been aggravated by the recent flood catastrophe. The committee print provides for admission of 20,000 persons from the Netherlands to help relieve the resulting economic pressure.

In addition, the committee print authorizes admission of 15,000 persons who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain countries and are now residing in the European NATO countries, Turkey, or Trieste. Turkey has admitted over 200,000 refugees of Turkish origin from Communist Bulgaria who sought to escape Communist rule. In addition, it has provided refuge to non-Turkish escapees and expellees. In Trieste and in a number of NATO countries the inability to absorb the influx of nonnationals who have escaped from the Communist regimes has given rise to economic as well as political problems. We should certainly make at least a token effort to give refuge in our own country to a fraction of these refugees.

The American Federation of Labor recognizes the need to keep out of this country those who would attempt to undermine our democratic institutions. As desirable and necessary as it is to provide a haven for the refugees from Communist territory, it is also necessary that there be adequate safeguards in legislation of this character. We support this proposal because we believe that it does contain such safeguards.

The committee print provides that no visa shall be issued to any person who has advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person or group of persons because of race, religion, or national origin or to any person who is a Communist or adherent of any other totalitarian system of government. Thus the committee print offers adequate assurance that no person will be admitted into this country who is a Communist or who supports any political system or philosophy contrary to our own democratic form of government.

The committee print also contains a number of important safeguards assuring that those admitted to this country will be self-supporting and will not contribute to unemployment of American workers. In the main it adopts safeguards similar to those which have proved beneficial under the Displaced Persons Act. The committee print requires that before any person will be admitted to this country assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States that he will be able to obtain suitable employment without displacing some other person from employment, that he and his family will not become public charges, and that they will have adequate housing without displacing others from housing accommodations.

We believe that enactment of this legislation is a necessary part of our fight against Communist tyranny. It will serve the best interests of our own Nation and of the free world by providing an assurance to the many refugees who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and to the millions still enslaved under Communist tyranny that they have not been forgotten and that we in the United States recognize that their devotion to democracy constitutes a fundamental contribution to the cause of freedom everywhere.

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor, I therefore urge the committee to recommend enactment of the proposed Emergency Migration Act of 1953.

CERTAIN SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED EMERGENCY MIGRATION ACT OF 1953 (S. 1917), SUBMITTED BY THE TOLSTOY FOUNDATION, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., having followed the Senate hearings and having testified in support of the principles sought to be established by this legislation, requests serious consideration of certain desirable specifications, affecting the allocation of special quota visas, assurances and the inclusion of additional groups of European escapees, at present residing outside of Europe.

I. *Allocation of special quota visas.*—It is suggested that section 4 (1) be amended to read as follows:

"Not to exceed one hundred and ten thousand visas to escapees and German expellees residing in the area of the German Federal Republic or in the western sectors of Berlin or in Austria: *Provided*, (a) That not to exceed twenty-five thousand visas within these one hundred and ten thousand be issued to escapees (in contradistinction to expellees) in the areas mentioned in this paragraph and, (b) that such visas shall be issued only in the area or areas mentioned in this paragraph."

Together with the 15,000 visas already provided for in section 4 (2), this amendment would guarantee a maximum within the terms of this act of 40,000 visas for European escapees from Communist-dominated countries, residing within the continental boundaries of Europe.

II. *European escapees from Communist countries*, although bodily not in Europe at present, yet as Europeans outside of Europe, in the Middle and Far East, are in exceptionally dangerous situation, under mortal threat to their lives. They also, if left at the mercy of Communists, whether these latter have assumed power as in China proper or as yet only threaten to take power, as in the Middle East and Iran, provide by the very fact of their destitution and mortal fear, being genuine anti-Communists who fled from their homelands between the two world wars, a fertile ground for antiwestern, anti-American propaganda in a cold war, where the Communists do not miss any slightest chance to ridicule the action or inertia of the West.

We have proof that among escapees from Sinkiang and Kashmir, now in Communist China, there are genuine political escapees from U. S. S. R., who have braved the hardships of crossing the Himalayas, the Gobi Desert, and Tibet. Among them are the very peoples of Russia from Russian Kazakhstan, Turkestan, and other similar areas, many of whom were exiled by the Bolshevik rulers to concentration camps bordering on China. Any legislation covering escapees should not fail to take into account these very special groups of proven anti-Communists. Therefore, the limiting factors of any emergency legislation to be enacted should be—

(1) Definite numbers allocated to specific geographical areas.

(2) Determination of limiting datelines to be examined according to geographical areas and to prevailing circumstances existing in countries of asylum at time of escape and at present, rather than rubberstamping human beings with datelines based on external factors, such as beginnings and ends of hostilities, financial considerations, etc. Innumerable, almost irreparable mistakes of the past have been inflicted upon these victims of communism, to whom the West was supposedly offering a door to freedom and opportunity and therefore any emergency legislation on the part of the United States of America should be directed toward psychological rectification of these mistakes, which were often dictated by subtle international fellow travelers, following the party line down to every detail, creating damage and chaos and thus distorting the best intentions of the West.

*Far East-China.*—The Shanghai-Tientsin-Hong Kong areas now fallen under Communist domination, present another vulnerable field of serious danger to some 10 to 15 thousand Russians, and are of grave concern to patriotic American welfare organizations. Nothing short of special coverage of this group of Soviet persecutces can save the lives of thousands of potential victims of communism.

Based on previous experience under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, approximately 5,000 were admitted from China and have proven good material for resettlement and have been satisfactorily assimilated within their own ethnic groups, mainly on the west coast.

Inclusion of 5,000 European escapees in the 1953 act should be clearly recognized as an act of Christian mercy on the part of the United States and its Con-

gress. It is a rescue operation to save part of a doomed group of some 15 to 20 thousand people, for the balance of which other resettlement opportunities outside the United States will have to be sought.

Under the Emergency Legislation Act of 1953, special quota immigrant visas should be issued to—

1. Anti-Communist escapees from Soviet Russia, at present residing in China, irrespective of the date they fled from within the borders of the Soviet Union.

2. Number of visas thus issued not to exceed 5,000 and provided that

3. Such visas be issued outside of Communist dominated areas, where these escapees presently reside.

*The Middle East and Iran.*—(1) Arab countries (Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Iraq): The number of European refugees in all these countries, does not exceed 1,000 persons. Ethnically they represent: Albanians, Yugoslavs, Russian Armenians, North Caucasians, and White Russians.

The North Caucasians, some 300 persons, are mostly in Jordan and Syria. They are part of the great anti-Communist movement of whole Caucasian tribes, numbering some 12,000 persons, which retreated from the Caucasus with the Germans, fleeing the Red armies. In 1945-46 many thousands escaped repatriation in Germany and Austria, and up to 5,000 persons were granted political asylum in Turkey. King Abdullah of Jordan also granted asylum to those groups who fled repatriation in Austria via northern Italy, where they continued to fight Italian Communist partisans. The Arab Governments have treated their Moslem brothers most generously, but notwithstanding the privileges extended to them, these Caucasians still remain aliens in a foreign country, with no traditional or cultural ties within these Arab lands. Even their language and their form of religion is different, and, as Europeans, they become an additional burden to these friendly governments, which are laboring under the pressure and problems of their own Palestinian refugees. These European refugees are not eligible for any form of assistance granted Palestinian refugees through United Nations Work and Relief Administration (UNWRA) and their privilege to work in countries immemorably afflicted with indigenous unemployment remain just paper permits, and they tend to blame for their misfortunes the injustice of the Yalta Agreement. They escaped repatriation twice; from Austria and Italy; they are a healthy, hardworking, honest and strongly anti-Communist element and in all justice they should be accorded treatment similar to that of the escapees stranded in Europe, as it is by mere chance that they find themselves stranded in the Middle East. The term "firmly resettled" should be defined so as to permit consular officials to judge such cases on their individual merits, taking into consideration the expressed desire of the Jordanian Government to see these people permanently resettled elsewhere and not establishing as ground for exclusion the privileges granted them at the time of their emergency admission as refugees from involuntary repatriation.

- (2) Iran: A special quota of immigrant visas, not to exceed 2,000 visas, to be issued in 5 countries of the Middle East and Iran, irrespective of date of flight from Communist-dominated Soviet Russia.

*Assurances.*—In accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to section 5 (d) of this act assurances shall be executed by a citizen or citizens of the United States and submitted to the coordinator. It is important to a technical detail in respect to American agencies, incorporated under the laws of the United States, so that they shall be considered as having the status of an American citizen and thus be qualified to file assurances on behalf of their defectors.

This was the working regulation that governed the relationship of the voluntary agencies with American governmental authorities under the so-called "blanket assurances", which greatly facilitated administration and the implementation of the migration acts.

*Conclusion.*—In further support of the passage of this proposed legislation, the Tolstoy Foundation respectfully submits statements by His Eminence, the Metropolitan Anastassy, President of the Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, and His Eminence, Leonty, Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America.

SYNOD OF BISHOPS OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH,  
OUTSIDE OF RUSSIA,  
New York 24, N. Y., June 8, 1953.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
*Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Having studied jointly with the Tolstoy Foundation bill S. 1917 entitled "Emergency Migration Act of 1953," the Holy Synod wishes to record its full support of the statement of the Tolstoy Foundation concerning this bill, which in general coincides with the proposals of the National Council of Churches and the National Lutheran Council.

We wish to express our specific concern about the desperate situation of Russian Orthodox Christians stranded in Communist-dominated China. Therefore, the Holy Synod specifically supports the inclusion of 5,000 European refugees now in China, the great majority of whom were, until the Communist conquest of China, under the canonical jurisdiction of the Holy Synod.

Likewise, the Holy Synod supports most strongly inclusion of 2,000 European refugees now in Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, etc., about whose specific plight we are gravely concerned.

Metropolitan Anastassy,  
By Archpriest GEORGE GRABBE,  
*Chancelor to the Synod.*

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH OF NORTH AMERICA,  
New York 3, N. Y., June 8, 1953.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION,  
*Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Having studied jointly with the Tolstoy Foundation bill S. 1917 entitled "Emergency Migration Act of 1953," the Russian Orthodox Church of North America wishes to record its full support of the statement of the Tolstoy Foundation concerning this bill, which in general coincides with the proposals of the National Council of Churches and the National Lutheran Council.

We wish to express our specific concern about the desperate situation of Russian Orthodox Christians stranded in Communist-dominated China. Therefore, the Russian Orthodox Church of North America specifically supports the inclusion of 5,000 European refugees now in China, the great majority of whom were, until the Communist conquest of China, active communicants of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Likewise, the Russian Orthodox Church of North America supports most strongly inclusion of 2,000 European refugees now in Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, etc., about whose specific plight we are gravely concerned.

Metropolitan LEONTY,  
Archbishop of New York,  
*Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America.*

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,  
Washington 6, D. C., June 3, 1953.

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary,  
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congress of Industrial Organizations takes this means of placing before you and the other members of the subcommittee its views with regard to S. 1917. We respectfully request that the subcommittee incorporate this letter in its hearings.

S. 1917 would authorize the admission, as special-quota immigrants, of 240,000 immigrants from Europe during the next 2 years. Essentially, this bill would amount to a renewal of the displaced-persons program, which expired about a year ago.

The CIO strongly supported the Displaced Persons Act. We believe that it was a wise and humane measure. Under that act, approximately 400,000 persons were admitted to this country. They have been absorbed into the life of our country with relative ease. The Nation has been enriched by the addition of

thousands of farm and factory workers, engineers, doctors, technicians, and other persons possessing other needed and valuable skills. The displaced persons admitted under this program have shown remarkable ability to adapt themselves to American ideologies and institutions. They have fully assumed their obligations as American workers and are rapidly assuming the obligations and securing the rights of American citizenship.

By the admission of these displaced persons, the United States not only strengthened itself, but won friends abroad. The displaced-persons program was clear evidence that the United States, as a leader of the free world, was willing to do herself what she asked other free nations to do—admit refugees to her shores.

These same considerations and others lead us to support S. 1917. Its enactment could be fully justified on humanitarian principles alone. Our experience under the Displaced Persons Act shows that the refugees admitted would make a valuable contribution to American life and that they could, in the numbers proposed, be easily absorbed without any deleterious effect on the economy. Further, it will stimulate resistance to Russian aggression and oppression for us to do our part in offering a new future to those who have escaped from Communist tyranny. This S. 1917 would do by providing special quotas for escapees and expelled from Communist-dominated countries now living in Germany and Austria and elsewhere in Western Europe.

In addition, this legislation would help to ease the burden of overpopulation in parts of Western Europe and in Greece through increased immigration. While the numbers of persons who would be admitted under the bill would be too limited to constitute alone a major contribution toward this end, the adoption of this legislation by this country would no doubt encourage other nations to adopt similar emergency programs, which together might considerably alleviate excess population problems.

We tend to question the desirability of the provision of S. 1917 giving priority to farm workers. This provision might be viewed as a subtle discrimination against certain ethnic groups who have been in the past denied the opportunity to engage in farm work. Further, we believe that the proper way and the only way to secure and maintain an adequate farm labor force is by improving wage and working conditions on the farms.

Finally, we wish to make it clear that we do not regard this bill as a substitute for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act. We have heretofore stated our opposition to that Act, and we shall continue to urge its replacement by fair and liberal permanent legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,  
*President.*

---

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST  
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, June 8, 1953.

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: I deeply regret that in concluding so quickly our testimony this morning before your committee adjournment, Dr. Empie and I failed to express our strong endorsement of special immigration legislation for citizens of the Netherlands.

It is our belief that such legislation is justified on its own merits for reasons which should not be confused or obscured by inclusion in an emergency bill designed to bring relief to countries and groups incapable of solving their own problems. This is not the situation in the Netherlands, which itself has contributed and is contributing so generously to the solution of refugee and other postwar problems in Europe and elsewhere. We feel that it would be a doubtful compliment to the great Dutch people and their illustrious Queen to use their high reputation in this country as a factor of support for what we regard as the unwise inclusion in this bill of overpopulation problems in other countries.

Therefore, we would greatly prefer to see our Congress act favorably on one of the bills already introduced for the special nonquota admission of Dutch nationals.

If, after further consideration, your committee should feel that provision for the Dutch should come within the total of 240,000 special visas, we would respectfully suggest the desirability of restricting such visas to "Dutch returnees and flood victims" so that the Congress would avoid setting a precedent of appearing to

deal with overpopulation problems via United States immigration, a precedent which many believe is unsound and inadequate.

Again, let me thank you and your committee for their generous reception of our testimony this morning. May I impose on your generosity further to ask that this letter be added to our testimony.

Cordially yours,

R. A. ELLIOTT,  
*Director, Immigration Services, Department of Church World Services*

NEW JERSEY COUNCIL ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION,  
*Newark, N. J., June 8, 1953.*

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee, Immigration and Nationality,  
House Judiciary Committee, House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted on June 5 by the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation which your committee is now considering.

We would appreciate it if you would give this resolution your consideration and enter it in the record of the hearings which the committee is now holding.

Very truly yours,

AMERIGO D'AGOSTINO.

#### RESOLUTION OF EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Whereas the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation has since its inception urged revision of our present immigration policy, and specifically the McCarran Immigration Act, because of the many unjust, undesirable and undemocratic provisions of the act, some of which are (1) the national origins quota system, (2) inequality of status given to naturalized citizens, (3) lack of procedural and legal safeguards; and

Whereas since these necessary revisions are not being made in the present session of the Congress; and

Whereas among our concerns were the plight of refugees from the political and religious persecution—the plight of persons displaced as a result of World War II and economic displacement contributing to what is more commonly referred to as overpopulation; and

Whereas President Eisenhower, in addition to having pointed out the need for revision of our immigration legislation, has also recommended to the Congress that emergency legislation be enacted which will permit a flow of immigration to aid in the relief of the problems referred to above; and

Whereas the United States has traditionally been a haven of hope for the oppressed and distressed and as such has been a symbol of mankind's highest aspirations, and, therefore, has indicated to all peoples the superiority of the free world over that of totalitarian despotism; and

Whereas the adoption of emergency immigration legislation to admit 240,000 persons at this time would further reaffirm our good will and would relate directly to the ability and will of our allies to meet the threat of international communism: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation reiterating its position in favor of revision of our present immigration laws, at the same time supports and encourages the immediate passage of emergency immigration legislation which will provide for the entry in the United States of 240,000 persons including refugees from totalitarian tyranny; persons who were displaced as a result of World War II and economically displaced persons from allied nations which are considered to be overpopulated; and be it further

*Resolved*, That categories of persons to be admitted by means of such emergency immigration legislation shall not be on the basis of the national origins, but shall instead be based on the following criteria: (1) Right of asylum, (2) reunion of families, (3) needs in the United States, (4) special needs in the free world; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the New Jersey Council on Immigration Legislation shall forward copies of this resolution forthwith to the appropriate legislative committee as well as to the President and members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress.



SUPREME LODGE, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,  
OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL DEPUTY,  
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1953.

Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization,*  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: As requested by our supreme venerable, George J. Spatuzza, of Chicago, I am sending you herewith a statement which you will include kindly in the report of your committee, in order that our testimony shall be brought up to date.

With personal regards, I am,  
Very truly yours,

L. H. PASQUALICCHIO,  
*National Deputy.*

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY L. H. PASQUALICCHIO, NATIONAL DEPUTY, THE  
ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA

Mr. Chairman and committee members, I am L. H. Pasqualicchio, of Washington, D. C., national deputy and official representative of the supreme lodge of the Order Sons of Italy in America.

I appeared before Subcommittee No. 1, House Committee on the Judiciary, May 23, 1952, recommending the approval of Representative bill H. R. 7376, introduced by Representative Celler, in 1952.

I wish to report also that I appeared before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization on May 27, 1953, in support of bill S. 1917, providing for the admission of 240,000 nonquota immigrants within a period of 2 years, as requested by President Eisenhower.

I am very much in favor of the provisions of bill S. 1917, because they definitely designate the different countries and the number of nonquota visas allotted to each country. Such an arrangement will avoid doubt in the minds of the different nationality groups as to just how many visas shall be allotted to them.

In the past, local representatives of nationality minority groups would have to engage in an active campaign so that their nationality would be given proper consideration. It was a continuous annoyance to the President of the United States and to all the Members of Congress. Therefore, a bill similar to that of S. 1917, would be acceptable to us.

The admission of 240,000 immigrants within a period of 2 years would not be an economic strain to America. Such a program would probably eliminate from relief roles in Europe 500,000 people yearly, because all of the immigrants admitted would immediately be given employment and become self-sustaining. They would also be able to render financial assistance to their relatives and friends abroad.

The number of immigrants admitted under this bill would not materially disrupt our immigration program. We allow by law, 150,000 immigrants each year from all countries of the world, but in the past 6 years less than 100,000 a year have been admitted legally. This situation, as we all know, is caused by the inadequacy of our existing immigration laws in having perpetuated the national origin quota system.

The Order Sons of Italy, being an American Institution organized over 50 years ago, primarily considers the economic and social welfare of the United States. We do not wish to support or recommend anything which may prove harmful or detrimental to the future progress and greatness of America. A strong and powerful America means freedom, peace, and happiness to mankind throughout the civilized world.

We must fully realize that the horrible problem of escapees drifting about in strange lands, unwanted and depending upon public charity, does not present an encouraging picture. We shall not have peace during our lifetime unless we are able to give some of these unfortunate people employment and a home. They should be given an opportunity to become self-sustaining and an asset to a community rather than a burden.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the chairman and members of this committee in permitting me to file this statement and bring my testimony up to date.

SUPREME LODGE,  
ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA,  
Chicago 2, Ill., April 27, 1953.

HON. LOUIS F. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization,  
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed herewith, please find copy of resolution adopted at the meeting of the Supreme Council of the Order Sons of Italy in America, held at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., this past April 11 and 12.

The members of the Supreme Council feel that under your able leadership the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization will give this matter its due consideration.

It is the fervid wish of the entire membership of the order that changes in the existing laws on the subject matter may be made and effectuated in conformity with the views in the within resolution contained.

Please accept our deep appreciation for your interest in this most important matter.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE ORDER SONS OF ITALY  
IN AMERICA, IN PLENARY SESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 11, 1953

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident throughout the entire Nation that the adoption of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not adequately solve immigration and naturalization problems, but, on the contrary, denies essential principles which have been of the utmost importance in the natural development of our beloved country, the United States of America; and

Whereas the general welfare of the people of our Nation requires that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be modified and amended to safeguard the inalienable rights heretofore enjoyed by all citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the problems surrounding immigration and naturalization have become serious problems not only for the people of the United States of America but also for the people of many other nations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Supreme Council of the Order Sons of Italy, in plenary session at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., on April 11, 1953, That the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 be amended as follows:*

1. The inequalities and injustices which can and do arise under existing immigration quota system based on national origins should be minimized by the suggestions herein advanced.

2. The annual immigration quota should be 250,000 which number we believe can be conveniently absorbed by this country.

3. The quotas of all nations should be reexamined every 3 years. The number of visas to be allotted to each nation should be based upon the average number used by such nations during the preceding 3 years. All unused quotas should be reallocated. Countries which have used up to 90 percent of their quota should be allowed to participate in the distribution of unused quotas on the same ratio as heretofore established.

4. Adopted children under the age of 14 should be given preference and admitted in the same category as children are generally now admitted.

5. That parents of American citizens should be admitted as nonquota immigrants.

6. Although the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, should be continued as a part of the McCarran-Walter Act in order to make possible the codification of all laws relating to immigration and naturalization, the persons actually admitted as displaced persons should be admitted in addition to established quotas.

7. The judicial powers given to administrative officers, boards, and any other governmental agencies should be eliminated. Any person or persons having powers of prosecution should not be granted any judicial powers which deprive an individual of his rights to trial by the courts of the United States. Furthermore, the provisions of the statute of limitations heretofore existing should be reenacted.

8. Naturalized citizens should enjoy all the rights and privileges of native-born citizens as heretofore established by the Constitution of the United States: Be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the chairmen of both Senate and House Committees on Immigration and Naturalization.

In witness whereof, I, the supreme venerable of the Order Sons of Italy in America, have hereunto set my hand, the date and year aforesaid.

GEORGE J. SPATUZZA,  
*Supreme Venerable, Chicago, Ill.*

Attest:

A. A. DEMARTINIS,  
*Supreme Recording Secretary, Philadelphia, Pa.*

---

MASSACHUSETTS BAPTIST CONVENTION,  
DEPARTMENT OF CHRISTIAN FRIENDLINESS,  
*Boston 8, Mass., May 18, 1953.*

Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*Chairman, Judiciary Committee,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I would like to urge that the Judiciary Committee take early and favorable action on emergency and temporary action to admit 240,000 people to this country who have been displaced because of political conditions in Europe. America, which has been traditionally the land of liberty and hope to distressed people everywhere, needs to take the lead to bring relief and a new life to people who are in such desperate straits. Such a policy will show that America is concerned for the impoverished and the downtrodden and will be one of the best things we can do to improve our relations with other countries.

We will benefit from it also within our own borders. We all come from immigrant background, and we know how much this continuing immigration has meant to American life. Each new group of immigrants have made contributions to America which have been invaluable and without which our country would not be the great Nation which it has become. This group which needs to be brought now would make such a contribution in the coming years.

Some people have objected, saying that we have no more room, but that objection has been heard since the earliest years of our country. There has been room in the past; there is room now, and there will be room for many years to come. Those brought in under the last displaced-persons legislation are already well on their way to integration in America life. Our American Baptist Convention brought over about 5,000 persons under the displaced-persons program and with only one or two exceptions all are becoming part of America, some owning their own homes and all looking forward to the day when they will become citizens. These are people who are happy even to pay income tax.

In order that more may come to benefit from American life even as we will in turn benefit from them, I urge again that legislation be considered to admit 240,000 persons on a nonquota basis.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH MILLER.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Javits, we will be very glad to hear from you.

## STATEMENT OF HON. JACOB K. JAVITS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee on so important a matter. I would not think of taking your time to present cumulative testimony or just to add my support of the fundamental principles involved in the legislation you are considering, but I do have some special connection with this subject, as I will describe in a moment, so that if my own experience can be of any aid to the subcommittee, I feel it my duty to make it available.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which in 1947 investigated the displaced persons situation. That committee was under the chairmanship of my colleague, Mr.

Fulton, of Pennsylvania. Upon our return, we made a report which I believe had some influence with this committee in its displaced persons legislation. At the end of 1949 and again at the end of 1951 as a member of study missions for the Foreign Affairs Committee, I spent a considerable amount of time in Europe on two subjects: 1, the escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, who were heavily concentrated in Berlin in various establishments maintained by the city of Berlin at that time; and, 2, in my relationship to the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I looked into the problem of surplus working populations in Italy, Holland, and other such problems which affect the situation in Europe. It is from those points of view, and based upon that special information, that I would like to testify before the committee.

I am also, Mr. Chairman, the sponsor or author of H. R. 4935 which the committee is graciously considering, I understand, together with the other bills put in by other members. I might say that this is a counterpart of a measure introduced in the other body by Senators Ferguson, Ives, and Hendrickson, which they were good enough to let me sponsor here, which sought to implement the original letter.

Mr. CELLER. You say they were good enough?

Mr. JAVITS. I generally ask before I put in a bill which copies of bills they put in the other body. I rather feel that we cooperate insofar as any progress can be made.

This bill seeks to implement the President's message for the admission of 240,000 refugees and escapees in the next 2 years. This bill has subsequently of course been superseded by a bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator who is conducting these hearings in the other body, Senator Watkins, and I gather that there is a committee print before this committee very much like the Watkins bill.

With that background, I would like to emphasize one thing that I think is of supreme importance in this whole situation. This is really a measure of the highest foreign policy. It affects very materially the blows which we are in a position to strike against the Communist-bloc countries. It is a very material question of aiding our allies in Europe who have a very serious problem of these escapees and who have very serious surplus working populations of their own.

As to the escapees, I feel, and in the Foreign Affairs Committee I think there is a great deal of sentiment of the same character to back up my own views, that the strongest blow which we have struck against the Communist-bloc countries yet is the defection of Yugoslavia. This may very well mark the beginning of the tide away from gilding Communist strength and I believe that the Communists themselves consider that the most serious blow they have had against them, so I believe that these escapees from behind the Iron Curtain represent in a personal sense as serious a blow.

They demonstrate to the world that this is not paradise, but far from it, and that anybody with spunk or any taste for freedom is very anxious to get out from behind that Iron Curtain.

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt at this point, Mr. Javits? I assure you that I for one appreciate very much your cooperation in matters of this sort. You have been very helpful ever since we tried in the beginning to formulate a displaced persons program. The work in your

committee has been very helpful in setting up the international organization to move migrants.

Will you tell me wherein this bill of yours, H. R. 4935, differs from the Celler bill? That was the original proposal last year.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe—and Mr. Celler will correct me—that the Celler bill sets up certain specific categories to which the visas shall be allocated of ethnic Germans, et cetera, whereas this bill of mine and the gentleman to whom I have referred in the Senate proposes to vest, as did the displaced persons bill, administrative discretions of the whole problem of the allocation of visas.

I think that is the essential and fundamental difference.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, the Truman proposal sets forth categories?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. WALTER. And you would leave it to the President to decide where the 240,000 were to go?

Mr. JAVITS. I would say, in addition, if I may, Mr. Walter, that the Eisenhower proposal did not set forth categories.

Mr. WALTER. I do not agree with you at all because the bill introduced in the Senate and the committee print that we have before us spells out the allocations.

Mr. JAVITS. They do, but I am speaking of the original Eisenhower letter. In addition, may I say that when Senators Ferguson, Ives, and Hendrickson put in their bill they thought they were implementing the President's suggestion, and so did I, and it may very well be that the administration has given its blessing to the Watkins bill in the idea of allocating the visas.

Mr. WALTER. I understand that that is the administration bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that would be a very important point to ascertain. I must say that I am not in a position to say that authoritatively. We thought we were implementing the President's proposal when we put in a bill which did not set up specific categories for the distribution of these 240,000.

Mr. WALTER. I prefer this proposal of yours because those numbers were arbitrarily arrived at and not based on anything we could substantiate or justify and the thing that disturbs me is the possibility of our Nation being charged with discriminating against races, for example.

Mr. JAVITS. I join with you in that and for this reason: I join in it because I believe we have had such extraordinarily good experience with the displaced persons law, considering the fears which were expressed and which so many of the gentlemen on this subcommittee, Judge Walter, Mr. Celler, the chairman, and Miss Thompson were so eloquent in rebutting, and really very few, if any, of these fears have shown the remotest grade of fact. Therefore, I think the more we capitalize upon the precedent which is in the displaced persons bill, the more likely it is to convince the Congress that this is a wise thing to do, and it is a fact that the displaced persons bill did not attempt in the legislation itself to allocate these visas.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; but the Displaced Persons Act, which I helped sponsor, in the end result developed inequalities as between various countries, so what difference would it make if you set forth a target of certain numbers which were fixed in my bill, or if you have the result which might be deemed obvious? What difference would it make?

Mr. JAVITS. I think, first, the gentleman is entitled to all kinds of credit, and other members of the committee have been the first to see that he got it, for his wonderful job in this field. Second, we agree in the fundamental necessity for passing a bill of this character. This is a detail and I answer the detail as follows: You have in two respects the problem of negotiation with respect to the escapees, and the second point that I was going to make, and I might just as well make it now, is the heavy foreign policy impact, both of taking escapees and of helping Europe with its surplus working population, which, incidentally, is the fundamental way to help Europe, and this is based upon all the study that has been done in our committee.

Europe is plagued with a chronic and continuous problem of overpopulation of working people.

The second point that I was going to make, and it might just as well be made here, is that none of these programs have ever gotten off the ground, whether it is this migrant program for surplus workers or this escapee program, unless we took what is commonly called our fair share—that was the phrase coined in the bill, and Mr. Celler may have coined it—and we have flexibility of negotiation. We are in a big negotiation on this migrant question.

Unquestionably, the same kind of negotiation will take place with respect to these escapees. An effort will be made to parcel them around and to hold open places to attract other countries, very much to our interest. I therefore feel, and I am not passionate about this, that in view of the experience under the DP law and the fact that this is bound to be the subject of negotiation, it is true, that you may have inequalities with a specification, as you did without, but at least you give yourself freedom to negotiate.

That to me seems to be the determining reason why I would favor the idea of giving the President the total visas for use in connection with these negotiations. I cannot assure you and no one can that this will work out less or more equitably than your delineation of the categories except that I do think it gives greater negotiating strength in an area in which we will be negotiating.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with you if we had a general principle enunciated in an immigration clause that we could take in a certain number of persons, train our sights on, say, 150,000, or whatever the amount may be, and then have that amount divided equitably by some administrative agency rather than have a quota system.

In the quota system we give rise to the charge of discrimination, but we do not have that principle enunciated.

Mr. WALTER. At that point, I would like to ask you a question. Mr. Celler said that the quota system gives rise to charges of discrimination. What is there in the Immigration and Nationality Code that is anti-Semitic? I have heard that charge.

Mr. CELLER. I did not raise it.

Mr. WALTER. You did not raise it, but I have heard it all over and it hurts me. I want you to point out to me what there is in the recently enacted Immigration and Nationality Act which is anti-Semitic.

Mr. JAVITS. Judge, I think I can answer that without qualification. As far as I know, there is nothing in the code which is anti-Semitic. I will say there in fairness to what you heard and in fairness to you that I believe that any minority in this country which is intelligent feels that whatever imperils any other minority, whether it is a minor-

ity of race or faith or whether it is a minority of class, such as naturalized versus natural born citizens, imperils all minorities.

Hence, you have the very strong feeling by many minorities, not just the Jewish people, that the McCarran Immigration Act has these very grave discriminations and injustices. However, to say it is anti-Semitic I think is a broad generalization without meaning in the terms of the law.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, and that was a device resorted to very early in order to discredit the law and to arouse the passions of the people with the hope that it might be repealed and by repealing it make it possible for these gangsters and racketeers who are being deported daily, to remain in the United States. That is what is back of all it.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope you will not mind if I do not join you in all of that latter statement, but I do not think it is germane to this discussion. I think I have answered the question.

Mr. GRAHAM. The time for our hearing is short and we want to hear you. Will you confine yourself to the subject matter and do not allow these gentlemen or ladies to distract you.

Mr. JAVITS. Judge Graham, as you know, I voted against this particular statute which we are discussing for reasons I believe in good conscience to be sound and which continue sound and I am very anxious to see it repealed. I have finished my statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you. Are there any questions?

Mr. HILLINGS. With reference to your bill, Mr. Javits, to allow the President to set the numbers of people in the areas into which they would be brought, is not the real danger that you are going to give rise to tremendous political pressure on the Chief Executive and members of his staff in order to accomplish the thing that your bill wants to accomplish?

Mr. JAVITS. Might I tell my colleague, Mr. Hillings, that, first, this is what the President asked for, as I understand it, so he knows best whether he is willing to take the political pressures. In other words, he asked for 240,000 visas.

Second, I believe you have a balance of convenience. Which is the more important, to put this in a definite compartmental basis in the statute, or to give yourself freedom to negotiate? The idea is not alone that you are willing to take 240,000 people of these categories; the idea is also that you want to use that to encourage others to jointly soak up the whole burden. I believe that the latter is so much more important than the incidental pressures or anything else that might arise or dissatisfactions or different nationality groups that the weight of the greatest benefit in this bill is in giving us the freedom to negotiate which this 240,000 units will give us.

Mr. HILLINGS. You do not think it might tend to build up some hatred among the various nationalities? For example, Italians have already exerted great pressure to bring in people to offset their surplus, population problem. People from the other areas of the world, Chinese and others, who might want to come in, although I am not so sure whether your bill would actually allow the Asiatics, but the other nations certainly will be exerting great pressure to bring their people in.

I take it from what you just said that you do not think that is liable to create a very hectic or difficult situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not say that. I do believe it could create a hectic and difficult situation, but less difficult than the situation

which we face of a mass of people who need to be resettled, with us making a contribution toward their resettlement which can be the most effective made if it is kept flexible.

In other words, you are dealing with a hectic situation. The fundamental purpose of this legislation is dual: One, to take in some people, but, two, and equally important, to get others to do the same. It is on the latter count that I feel the general allocation idea is preferable. Everyone may have their own judgment. That is my best judgment.

Mr. CELLER. You would say we cannot solve all the immigration ills of the whole world?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly not.

Mr. GRAHAM. Miss Thompson, are there any questions?

Miss THOMPSON. No.

Mr. GRAHAM. Have you any questions, Mr. Celler or Mr. Walter?

Mr. CELLER. No.

Mr. WALTER. Do you not think that your findings of fact, Mr. Javits, in section 2 might create some animosities? What is the heart of Europe?

Mr. CELLER. Do you mean Germany? That is the only place they are escaping.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, through the Iron Curtain into Western Germany. I think that can be refined.

Mr. GRAHAM. Are there any other questions?

If not, thank you, Mr. Javits.

Mr. JAVITS. Thank you very much.

**STATEMENTS OF CRETE ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE  
ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF THE NATIONAL  
AMERICANISM COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, AND  
CLARENCE H. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL  
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION**

Mr. GRAHAM. Will you give your name and title to the reporter, please?

Mr. ANDERSON. Crete Anderson. I am from Canton, Ohio. I am a businessman. I am not a member of the paid staff of the American Legion. My connection with the Legion is that of chairman of the immigration and naturalization committee which is a subcommittee of the national Americanism commission of the American Legion.

I would like to thank the chairman and members of the committee on behalf of the Legion for the courtesy you have shown us in permitting us to present to you the highlights of our views on the subject matter on which you are holding these hearings.

I have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, which is almost the same as the statement we presented before the companion committee of the Senate on their hearings on S. 1917. There are a few additions in this statement that we have here today. I would like, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to read the first paragraph of the statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. All right. Read any part you wish to read.

Mr. ANDERSON. This sets forth in broad terms the long-range policy of the American Legion in matters pertaining to immigration



and naturalization. This is an extract taken from the Americanism Manual of the American Legion, page 41, which reads in part as follows:

The American Legion has consistently opposed any great influx of immigrants and has insisted that immigration should be on such a moderate and regulated scale that immigrants may be readily absorbed into the lifestream of our country. The Legion has insisted that immigrants should not be admitted in such numbers that they would displace veterans from either employment or housing. It has supported the National Origins Quota Act of 1924 and Public Law 414, 82d Congress, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, which set a quota for immigration from the respective countries, based on a selective and restrictive system, in proportion to the number of United States citizens, who themselves or through their ancestors originated in the respective countries. The Legion has vigorously opposed exceptions to this quota system, except (1) as they applied to honorably discharged wartime veterans of the United States armed forces, their wives or immediate dependents and, except (2) emergency admission of 400,000 displaced persons and German ethnics as the United States fair share of this humanitarian task.

Mr. CELLER. What was the date of that? Is that manual current?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, Congressman Celler. That is the current manual.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do you wish to continue reading, or ad lib from there on?

Mr. ANDERSON. My statement, Mr. Chairman, is not a lengthy one. It consists of four pages.

Mr. GRAHAM. Maybe it will shorten the whole thing by having you read it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

The Legion is convinced that efforts to effect entry into the United States of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons, escapees, evacuees, and expellees, together with substantial numbers of over-populations and/or nationals of European countries, is a calculated attempt at a "back door" attack on the national origins quota system as embodied in the McCarran-Walter Act, fostered or supported, in the majority of instances by the same groups which have advocated emasculation of the act to the extent that it would become ineffective legislation, forsaking our longstanding traditional policies.

Such action beggars and ignores the fact that the proper committees of the Congress, duly elected representatives of the people of the United States, assisted by the Department of Justice, the Visa and Passport Divisions of the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency and other qualified and capable authorities, labored nearly 5 years in the formulation of the act; that approximately 1,000 persons testified in the hearings, including experts and Government officials, and that representatives of all groups concerned with the problem were heard.

The Legion has not in the past, and is not now, endeavoring to "expert" on all the technical phases of our complete immigration and naturalization laws, comprising 164 sections in the existing legislation, but rather, confines itself to matters that fall within the purview of its stated policies, lore and mandates. Among those that are pertinent to the subject matter before this committee are:

(1) The tightening of our gates against the entrance of all subversive, criminal and illegal elements and the deportation of like millions who have, legally or illegally gained admission;

(2) A controlled steady influx of immigrants under the selective and restricted provisions of the national origins quota system;

(3) A belief that migration to the United States is a privilege and not a right. The philosophy of "right of asylum," when unearned, falls on deaf ears in the Legion. We are somewhat bemused by the thought as to where Americans would find "right of asylum," even among the friendly countries, should total disaster befall us.

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt? I remind you of something that we never hear anybody talk about: Our immigration laws are the most liberal of any nation in the world.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with you, Congressman Walter, on that.

Mr. WALTER. That is a fact. I am having a staff work on that question now and you will see when all of this data have been developed that we have the most liberal laws in the world.

Mr. GRAHAM. Go ahead, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. (4). The Legion believes that the essential and paramount element in any consideration of mass resettlements in the United States is: Is it good for the United States now and in the future? The Legion does not consider any such action to be presently beneficial and is dubious about future benefits.

The American Legion has been deeply concerned, for some time past, over the presence in our country of an estimated 3 to 5 million illegal aliens, the potential danger to our industrial, power and communication installations being readily apparent should the hour strike and we become involved in a war, declared or undeclared, with Russia. The impossibility of properly screening the 125,000 escapees and expellees from behind the Iron Curtain, as proposed for resettlement in the United States under S. 1917, 83d Congress, due to the complete absence of any authentic information as to life history or background, could only result in our investigating agencies taking a coldly calculated risk that we can ill afford to take in these dangerous times.

Should our investigators be 99 percent correct in their risky decisions, and wrong in the remaining 1 percent, it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present dangerous "powder keg" situation. The proposal to allot the remaining 115,000 of the 240,000 total in S. 1917, 83d Congress, to nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, establishes a precedent that this Nation has, invariably, avoided in the past.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions on this paragraph.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would you prefer to finish reading your statement and then answer questions, or would you care to be interrupted now and questioned?

Mr. ANDERSON. It makes no difference. I would be glad to endeavor to answer now.

Mr. HILLINGS. In this paragraph you just read, you mention:

The American Legion has been deeply concerned, for some time past, over the presence in our country of an estimated 3 to 5 million illegal aliens.

Could you elaborate a little on that? Where do you get that information? Where do you get the information that there are 3 to 5 million illegal aliens in this country at the present time?

Mr. ANDERSON. That information came from this article in the Readers Digest, the author of which is Congressman Walter.

Mr. HILLINGS. That is a pretty good source.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be glad to submit this.

Mr. HILLINGS. Aside from that article, do you in the Legion know where most of these aliens are presently located?

Mr. ANDERSON. There was testimony before, I believe it was the Senate committee some 2 years ago in the hearings on the McCarran-Walter bill by members of the New York District of the Immigration Service, in which the statement was made by these employees of the District of New York in the Immigration Service that there was an estimated 600,000 illegal aliens in the area of greater New York alone. I have further heard that in the industrial heart of America, in the triangle, drawing a line from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Chicago, from Chicago, across Detroit and back to Pittsburgh, there are an estimated 350,000 to 400,000 illegal aliens in that industrial triangle of America.

Mr. CELLER. Where did you hear it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have read that, Congressman. I have no documentation on that, but the 600,000 illegal aliens in the New York area is testimony that was given to the Senate committee I referred to.

Mr. CELLER. I believe you will find that testimony was concerning wetbacks if you look at it carefully, and that there were apprehended yearly almost 500,000 wetbacks along the southern border. Then there are statements to the effect that for every wetback apprehended there are 3 wetbacks who go unapprehended and then statements to the effect that for every 1 caught there are 10 who are not caught. We get all sorts of figures. They are all rumors and stories. We have no authentic documents to prove it. I defy anyone to point to any authoritative source which would indicate the exact number of illegal aliens in this country.

Mr. HILLINGS. Let me just say that if this allocation, three to five million illegal aliens in this country, is true, or even if it is an exaggerated figure and part of it may be rumor, the fact that there would be several hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens in this country of course would be a matter of concern. Do you think the reason for it, assuming that there are large numbers of illegal aliens, as you allege here, is the failure of the Department of Justice to enforce the law? What is the reason for it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Congressman Hillings, the effort toward deportation of these people is very frustrating from the standpoint of the Immigration Service—it has been in the past so they have told me—and our protective laws are rightly so liberal that it is most difficult to deport an alien even if it is known he is in this country illegally. It has been in the past. There is the matter of manpower within the Immigration Service to run down these cases. They have testified that they did not have enough manpower to work on anything but cases that were on the record. They did not have the manpower to go out in the field and hunt down the ones that are here. As Congressman Celler said, and I will agree with him, there is no way of obtaining any authentic picture.

I have talked on many occasions with the authorities in the Immigration Service who handle that wetback thing. I have no doubt about the border situation. I have been down on the border. It is a chain reaction situation. They come across and they give them a haircut and a pair of shoes and delouse them, fix them up, and send

them back over. They then sell the shoes and then come back. They were flying them back into Mexico for a while, you know.

Congressman, you are probably familiar with that because it is close to your territory.

Mr. HILLINGS. We do not have the problem in California because there we contract for Mexican national laborers. The problem is primarily in some of the other States along the border, but California has been attacked many times unjustly because of that.

I want to ask you one other question in the paragraph. That concerns the last sentence where you say that the proposal to allocate the remaining 115,000 to 240,000 total to nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands establishes a precedent that this Nation has invariably avoided in the past.

Is it not the theory behind this request that if we would endeavor to take off some of the surplus population in these countries in question, recognizing that it really is a token gesture and that a tremendous surplus population exists throughout the world, we might set the example for other nations throughout the world such as Brazil and Australia to follow other countries in helping to met this problem? Do you not think that perhaps the theory in that regard has a certain amount of soundness to it?

Mr. ANDERSON. We admitted 400,000 displaced persons and German ethnics over a period of 3 years and it did not seem to establish any great precedence for other countries to follow. Brazil just recently announced at the Geneva meetings an appropriation of \$45 million for resettlement, but they have the wide open spaces in which to resettle these people. Later in my statement I answer some of these questions.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will answer some of the Congressman's questions if I proceed to read it.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I suggest that you continue your statement and we will question you after you finish.

Mr. ANDERSON. In an article entitled "The Truth About the Immigration Act", by Representative Francis E. Walter, appearing in May 1953 issue of Reader's Digest the following figures are most interesting:

Of the more than 1 million Europeans resettled by the International Refugee Organization 1 out of 3 has been taken by the United States. There remain, however, 10 million refugees from communism in Western Germany and, in other free areas of Europe, there are probably that many more. Overpopulation in Europe has been estimated as high as 79 million with a yearly increase of 3 million.

Any additional contribution that could be made by the United States to the solution of this gigantic problem of resettlement, through admissions to the United States as proposed in S. 1917 (83d Cong.), could be only a token gesture making no substantial impression on the overall problem and could create potential problems within our own borders when men in our Armed Forces return to civil life or in the event of a recession following a predicted peace—240,000 would constitute approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of the total escapees, expellees, evacuees and overpopulations in Europe.

The American Legion watches with battlewise eyes and a growing sense of injustice and frustration, together with tens of thousands of heartbroken mothers and fathers, the loading of the ships in San Francisco with the cannon fodder for Korea in the persons of our sons

and rightful heirs. The Legion has, also, observed the steady gaze eastward of many segments of our society, with barely a glance westward, for they are, apparently, more interested in the trek to America than in the trek away from it. In the latter case, in many instances, it will be some boy's final trek.

Remember, too, that the bulk of the young men who have gone off to war never held a job—they came from homes and schools—consequently they have no reemployment rights. They will have to search for their first jobs, as well as their housing, in markets that will be made more highly competitive if proposed legislation of this type is enacted.

The American Legion deeply regrets that, in this limited area of the many problems now confronting the President, they are at variance with him. Of the 3 million members of the American Legion, a large percentage of them served under the capable and courageous leadership of General Eisenhower in World War II. As President of the United States, he is our most distinguished member. The older members of the American Legion respect him to an extent beyond possible enhancement. Our younger members, the GI's, love and respect "Ike" to a degree akin to worship. The American Legion is confident that the President is aware of all of this.

The American Legion further regrets that legislation, so vital to the safety and welfare of the United States as is the McCarran-Walter Act, should have been tossed into the political arena, as was done following its passage over a Presidential veto. This has resulted in a state of confusion and misunderstanding on the part of many people in the United States, as to the principles, objectives, and merits of this vital legislation.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do you wish to amplify that statement before we proceed to question you?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to submit for the record, Mr. Chairman, if I may, mandates of the American Legion, resolution No. 31, of the national executive committee which was adopted in October 1952. For the information of the committee and for the record I would like to have this included in the record.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will be included.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

**RESOLUTION NO. 31—NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION—OPPOSE CONTEMPLATED ENTRANCE OF SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND DISPLACED PERSONS**

Whereas men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States must be protected jobwise upon their return to civilian life; and

Whereas the American Legion and all its affiliated groups must, if they are to justify their existence, protect the American standard of living; and

Whereas the sympathy of all goes out to those unfortunate people of other lands, but we of America must remember that charity begins at home until such time as our own problems are solved, which means and includes jobs and adequate housing for Americans now in our Armed Forces upon their discharge therefrom, we must oppose the entrance into this country and particularly into our metropolitan areas of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons for whom a concerted effort toward admission into the United States is presently being made through the medium of submitted and contemplated bills to the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Legion through its national commander petition the President of the United State and the Congress to oppose the contem-

plated importation of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons into the existing and future uncertain economy of our country.

Mr. ANDERSON. In reference to my use of the Reader's Digest article, I would like to submit this.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will be included.

(The article referred to follows:)

[From the Reader's Digest, May 1953]

### THE TRUTH ABOUT THE IMMIGRATION ACT

By Representative Francis E. Walter<sup>1</sup>

(Reprinted from the Congressional Record of April 23, 1953, where it appeared as an extension to the remarks of Senator Willis Smith of North Carolina)

Few domestic problems more directly involve the future of the United States than immigration. Few hotter issues face Congress and the administration than the McCarran-Walter Act, which last December, became our basic immigration law.

Why has this law been so bitterly attacked?

Some of the attack has been political—a result of the mistaken idea of some politicians that a bars-down immigration law is the way to win votes from so-called "minority groups" in this country. Some of the attack—the most vicious and violent part of it—has been led by Communist and leftwing organizations rightly fearful of its more rigid restraints on subversives. Not since the campaign to discredit Chiang Kai-shek and prepare the way for the Communist conquest of China have leftist forces in the United States been so aggressively united as in opposition to this law.

The campaign of misrepresentation which these forces have loosed is without parallel in recent legislative history. As a result, some newspapers, commentators, and numerous organizations have been grossly misled into joining the opposition. Hearing and reading their wholly unjustified attacks on the law, I am sure of one thing: They have never read it.

What is the background of this law? Both of its authors are Democrats. The House and Senate subcommittees charged with the bill's preparation each had 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans. In both subcommittees the vote for the bill was unanimous.

For the bipartisan support which the measure finally won, much credit must go to the members of both House and Senate committees and particularly to Senator McCarran, who gave notable leadership in the preparation and passage of the act.

The House vote on the bill was 206 for, 68 against. The favorable vote in the Senate was unrecorded.

President Truman vetoed the bill. Congress speedily overrode his veto by 278 to 113 in the House, 57 to 26 in the Senate.

Is it true, as charged, that the McCarran-Walter Act is "hysterical" legislation which was "rushed through Congress"?

The nearly 5 years of hearings, investigations, and research which went into the preparation of this law are said to be the longest period ever devoted to a single piece of legislation in the history of Congress. Public testimony, for and against, was taken from nearly 1,000 persons: Experts, Government officials, representatives of all of the groups concerned with the problem.

The two Federal agencies directly responsible for administering immigration and naturalization laws—the Departments of State and Justice—both set up committees of experts which gave continuous aid to the joint committee.

This long process of preparation was due to the determination of Senator McCarran and myself and the members of our committees that our bill, insofar as humanly possible, should be sound and workable and for the best interests of our country. As a result, the act—a document of 300 pages—was put through 6 complete revisions. The resulting measure, for the first time in our history, clarifies and codifies all of our previous hundreds of immigration enactments into a single law.

<sup>1</sup> Francis E. Walter, Democratic Representative from Pennsylvania, is coauthor, with Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act. Mr. Walter, says Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, is "one of the ablest and most conscientious Members of Congress."

The Departments of State and Justice both endorsed the bill as finally written. So did the Central Intelligence Agency. The head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service called it a desirable revision of our immigration and naturalization laws. No Government agency opposed it.

President Truman, in his attempt last fall to deliver the votes of minority groups, appointed a special commission on immigration. The report of this commission has given new force to the drive to discredit the McCarran-Walter Act. "From beginning to end," the commission concludes, "the act must be rewritten."

What is the truth about this law? Is it, as charged, "reactionary," "Fascist," "racist"?

The facts are that, in important particulars, it is the most liberal immigration law in United States history.

For the first time, all racial bars to immigration are removed. Asiatic countries are given annual immigrant quotas determined by the same formula as quotas for Europe.

For the first time, all racial bars to naturalization are removed. Thus, 85,000 orientals now living in the United States and Hawaii, heretofore ineligible for citizenship, may become citizens.

"This bill," said Congressman Walter H. Judd, former medical missionary in China, and authority on the Far East, "removes, at one stroke, the remaining racial discriminations in our nationality and immigration laws which have so greatly contributed to ill feeling in many parts of the world."

For the first time, provision is made to permit the quota-free entrance of the alien wives, husbands, and children of United States citizens. The national president of the YWCA testified before the Senate-House Committee: "We are delighted that the proposed revisions of the law are designed to further the preservation of family units."

For the first time, the doctrine "Once a Communist always a Communist" is rejected. A "redemptive" clause in the law makes eligible for entry ex-Communists who have proved a bona fide change of heart.

A spokesman for the American Civil Liberties Union said: "I want to express our agreement with the principle that past membership in either Communist or other totalitarian organizations will not forever be a bar to immigration into the United States."

Is it true, as charged, that the Immigration Act introduces "new forms of racial discrimination" which make it "an insult to all Asia"?

On the contrary, Asia, for the first time, is on a basis of equality. Special provision, however, had to be made for Asiatics residing outside Asia. There are 600,000 persons of Asiatic descent living in Central and South America, in countries where there is no numerical limitation for immigration. Brazil recently entered into an agreement with Japan to admit 45,000 Japanese families. To maintain the fairness of the quota system, the law now provides that such persons must enter the United States under the quota of the country of their racial origin.

This restriction was prepared with the active assistance of representatives of organizations of Asiatics in the United States. Every such important organization has gone on record endorsing the McCarran-Walter Act.

Is it true, as charged, that the new law "reduces the flow of immigrants to a trickle"?

With more generous provision for certain nonquota groups, and with quotas granted, for the first time, to 11 Asiatic countries, the total annual immigration to the United States is increased by a possible 25 percent—from 155,000 to approximately 200,000.

Is it true, as charged, that the Immigration Act "narrows the gateway to the United States" by requiring that 50 percent of immigrants "must be persons of high education, specialized experience, or exceptional ability"?

The law ends the old policy of accepting immigrants on the basis of "first come, first served." It establishes a policy of selectivity—similar to that of every other immigrant-receiving nation—aimed to secure those immigrants most likely to fit usefully into our economy and culture. To that end it sets up three categories of immigrants: persons of skilled or exceptional training; relatives of American citizens; other immigrants.

Fifty percent of each quota is reserved for the first—the skilled—category. The choice, here, is made as a result of specific requests by United States employers to the Attorney General. If, for example, dyemakers are in short supply, companies needing such skilled labor appeal to the Department of Justice, which,

through the United States Employment Service, verifies the need and instructs our overseas representatives to give preferred status to such workers.

The law, however, does not prescribe that 50 percent must be from that first category. If there are fewer than 50 percent of such persons on the list, then the quota is filled, as far as possible, from the second category. After those categories have been cleared, the remaining number are automatically assigned to the third category.

Is it true, as charged, that the new law "blunts one of our most important psychological weapons in the cold war" by preventing most of the people who escape from behind the Iron Curtain from reaching their hoped-for refuge in the United States?

Of the more than 1 million European refugees resettled by the International Refugee Organization, 1 out of 3 has been taken by the United States. Yet today, in West Germany alone, there are 10 million refugees from Communism. In other free areas of Europe there are probably that many more.

"It is demagoguery to contend," says the Washington News, "that this country can become a sanctuary for 'most' of these people. To lower our immigration bars will not solve this problem but only create a problem of our own."

Should our immigration policy, as proposed by the Truman commission, be "flexible enough to relieve overpopulation" and "permit the United States to engage fully in such migration efforts as may be important to the security of the free world"?

In Europe alone overpopulation has been estimated as high as 79 million. Yet every year Europe's population increases by another 3 million. A present proposal aims to move out 5 million people in the next 10 years—not noticeably affecting the problem.

"The United States," says the New York World-Telegram, "should do all it can to assist these people in finding new homes in areas of opportunity. But this country has long since passed the point where it can operate under a policy of unrestricted immigration, which is virtually what some people are seeking."

Last year I was a United States delegate to the meeting in Brussels which set up a 26-nation Organization for the Movement of Refugees from Europe. Our Government, I am proud to say, is taking the lead in attacking that problem. We must continue and increase our support for that work.

We must also, if the need arises, meet special problems with emergency legislation—as we have done during and since the war. But such special and emergency provisions should not be a part of our basic immigration law.

Is it true, as charged, that the new law "makes easy the deportation of thousands of worthy people"; that "it makes denaturalization a daily possibility for naturalized citizens"?

The Immigration Act excludes from the United States any alien whose presence would endanger the public safety. It provides for the deportation of any alien who engages in activities endangering the public safety.

Back of these provisions is a problem of serious proportions. At present there are from 3 million to 5 million aliens illegally in the United States. Deportation orders had already been issued for thousands of these persons. But, because of loopholes in the old law, these orders were unenforceable. As a result thousands of criminals and subversive aliens are roaming our streets, a continuing threat to the safety of our country.

Another equally startling fact: The then United States Attorney General presented to our committee an analysis of approximately 5,000 "of the more militant members of the Communist Party." This analysis showed that 91.5 percent of them were either of foreign birth, married to persons of foreign birth or born of foreign parents, and that over half of them traced their origins either to Russia or to her satellite countries.

With these and other facts before us, we wrote a law which makes it tougher for aliens to get into this country illegally. It makes it a crime for them to conceal their illegal status. It sets up better machinery for deporting them. It provides that naturalized citizens can be denaturalized and deported if, within 5 years of their naturalization, they join in subversive activity.

But the new law also provides that in every deportation case a hearing is mandatory and appeal to the courts is permitted. It also provides that in every case involving the revocation of citizenship the courts—and only the courts—can make the decision. In addition to this procedure the writ of habeas corpus is available.

Frank L. Auerbach, immigration expert in the Department of State, says: "The procedural safeguards afforded by the new act to an alien subject to deportation are greater than those enjoyed under the old law."



Aiming for a laxer law, the enemies of the Immigration Act center their heaviest attack on the national-origins quota system—the basis of our present policy. That system, said Mr. Truman, “breathes prejudice against the foreign-born.” To the Truman commission it is “racial and religious discrimination.”

The national-origins quota system has been basic to our immigration policy since 1924. Under it the United States has admitted, since 1929, nearly 5 million immigrants.

Through the use of an established, uniform formula or rule of law, that system is designed to do four things:

To limit the annual number of quota immigrants who can come to the United States;

To determine the nationality of those who come so as to maintain the historic population pattern of the United States;

To put all quota nations on an equal footing;

To keep the immigration problem beyond the reach of politics and pressure groups.

By the national-origins formula, the number of quota immigrants from each country is limited to one sixth of 1 percent of the inhabitants of the United States who in 1920 traced their origins to that particular country. That works out to an annual total, from 85 countries, of 154,657 immigrants—exclusive of nonquota immigrants.

By this system the number from each country is determined by mathematicians, not politicians.

Since the 1920 population of the United States was predominantly of West and North European origin, the countries in those areas have the largest quotas. The countries of Southern and Eastern Europe have smaller quotas. Thus the annual total for Ireland (Eire) is 17,756, whereas that for Poland is 6,488; for Belgium, 1,297, but for Greece, 308. The largest quotas are 65,361 for Great Britain and Northern Ireland; 25,814 for Germany.

The defense of this system has been well put by the Christian Science Monitor: “We believe it is a mistake to condemn any quota system based on national origins as inherently illiberal and an expression of religious or racial prejudice. It is no reflection on the many fine American citizens of all races, creeds, and national origins to recognize realistically that some nations are far closer to the United States in culture, custom and standard of living, respect for law, and experience in self-government.”

What is the alternative proposed by the Truman commission?

Instead of a national-origins quota system it proposes “a unified quota system.”

That system would provide no uniform, nonpolitical means for determining the source of immigration. It would vest in “an administrative agency” appointed by the President the vast power of choosing among nationalities.

Thus, this highly explosive problem would be brought within easy reach of politics and special-interest pressures. Instead of the present system under which “quotas are definite and automatically resist the pressure of special groups,” says the New York Herald Tribune, we would have a system where “quotas are indefinite and automatically invite such pressures.”

Is it not true that some countries, most notably Great Britain, do not use up their annual quotas and would it not be a good policy to distribute those unused quota numbers, at the end of every year, to nations where more people desire to come than on their quotas, are permitted?

Our joint committee of 7 Senators and 7 Representatives gave this problem serious study over many months. The question before us was simply this: By what means, free from political pressures, could these unused quotas be distributed?

To this question we were given two answers. The first was: Give the numbers to the nation where there was the greatest pressure to come. That country, we found, was China. The second answer was: Distribute the unused quotas on a basis of first come, first served. That proposal, we concluded, was administratively impossible to carry out and, even worse, it opened the door wide to the exercise of all kinds of political and group pressures and consequent ill will, both here and abroad.

The present law will undoubtedly undergo minor revisions as experience with its operation dictates. There have been some cases of individual hardship in its early application. Some of these cases have aroused what I believe will prove to be unjustified apprehensions among some of our friends abroad. I regret this and I am sure that, as the administration of the law improves, these incidents will not recur.

The aim of the opponents of this law is not to better its execution or revise its provisions but to destroy it. The issue thereby raised is clear. Are we to have an immigration policy—impossible of fulfillment—based primarily on the desires of Europe? Or are we to have a policy which is based primarily on what is good for America?

Mr. GRAHAM. Have you now finished?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Celler.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Anderson, is the statement that you read the considered judgment of the subcommittee of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is that, sir, and I might tell you who sits on that committee of which I have the honor of being chairman: Mr. Lee Pennington, who is one of the chief assistants to J. Edgar Hoover; Joe Ferris, an attorney from New York City, whom you may know, Congressman, who practices in immigration law and other general practice.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERSON. And people of that caliber are on the committee with me.

Mr. CELLER. How many members are there on the subcommittee?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are five members.

Mr. CELLER. Was this submitted to the Americanism Commission?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. The procedure is that any resolutions on immigration matters emanating on a post floor proceed from that post to the district and from the district to the department convention. If a resolution gets through those hurdles, it comes to the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Americanism Commission. If it passes there, it goes to the general Americanism Commission. If it passes that, it goes to the Americanism Convention Committee if it is appearing at the time of a convention.

Mr. CELLER. So this statement was not adopted by any convention of the American Legion?

Mr. ANDERSON. This statement here?

Mr. CELLER. The statement that you have just read.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir, that was not. This statement is based on the two mandates, Mr. Celler, that I have submitted for the record here.

Mr. CELLER. Did the Department of New York State pass on this?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, they did. They did not pass on this statement, if that is what you mean, sir.

Mr. CELLER. That is what I mean. This is not necessarily the judgment of the posts of New York State, for example?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is, sir, as reflecting their approval of the two resolutions, one of which was passed in October of 1952 and the other one in May of 1953.

Mr. CELLER. Was that resolution passed before General Eisenhower's recommendation?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true. It was before.

Mr. CELLER. What relation has it to the bills we have before us?

Mr. ANDERSON. It covers all such bills.

Mr. CELLER. It is just in general terms? Would you read it, please? I have not read it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Anderson, before reading let us establish the two dates. As I understand it, one is dated October of 1952 and the other is May of 1953?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. GRAHAM. The latter would really be subsequent to the statement of the President, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. The action of the national executive committee which handles the affairs of the American Legion, what we call by-meetings between times of conventions, with respect to the meeting of April 29, 30, and May 1, 1953, resulted in resolution No. 31 which I have submitted for the record.

Mr. CELLER. That is the executive committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the executive committee. Mr. Leo Lanning from New York was on the committee at that time.

Mr. CELLER. So on the executive committee, New York State, for example, had representation in that regard?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. Mr. Leo Lanning is your representative from New York.

Mr. CELLER. What is the gist of that resolution from the executive committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. The one that was passed prior to the request of President Eisenhower?

Mr. CELLER. That is the one of last October?

Mr. ANDERSON. Last October.

Mr. CELLER. What is the gist of that?

Mr. ANDERSON. This resolution originated in a post in Illinois. It came through the Department of Illinois, was passed by the department of Illinois, came to the subcommittee on immigration, the national subcommittee, was boiled down and rewritten in the subcommittee without changing the sense of it at all.

It was slightly too voluminous. It reads as follows:

#### OPPOSE CONTEMPLATED ENTRANCE OF SEVERAL THOUSAND DISPLACED PERSONS

Whereas men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States must be protected jobwise upon their return to civilian life; and

Whereas the American Legion and all its affiliated groups must, if they are to justify their existence protect the American standard of living; and

Whereas the sympathy of all goes out to those unfortunate people of other lands, but we of America must remember that charity begins at home until such time as our own problems are solved, which means and includes jobs and adequate housing for Americans now in our Armed Forces upon their discharge therefrom, we must oppose the entrance into this country and particularly into our metropolitan areas of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons for whom a concerted effort toward admission into the United States is presently being made through the medium of submitted and contemplated bills to the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Legion through its national commander petition the President of the United States and the Congress to oppose the contemplated importation of several hundred thousand additional displaced persons into the existing and future uncertain economy of our country.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Anderson, for the purpose of making the date clear, the President's letter, as I recall it, was dated April 22, 1953.

Mr. ANDERSON. The resolution I have just read is dated October 10, 11, and 12, 1952.

Mr. GRAHAM. For your information, Mr. Reed of Illinois, the chairman of our committee, just came in.

Mr. ANDERSON. That resolution originated in the department of Illinois and came up to the national in that manner.

Mr. GRAHAM. Are there any questions?

Mr. CELLER. In other words, the initiation of these proceedings started in a post in Illinois, went to the department of Illinois, and then went to the Americanism commission of the American Legion which referred it to the subcommittee on immigration of the Americanism commission; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. It proceeded through the department of Illinois through their executive committee or through their convention, Congressman Celler, and then to the national subcommittee on immigration.

Mr. CELLER. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, it originated on the post level.

Mr. CELLER. It originated at the post level and then went up to the hierarchy, as you expressed it, so that none of the other departments in the Nation had any cognizance of it except as they might have had representation on any of the committees or groups that you mentioned?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes and no, Congressman, for this reason: That the American Legion has a plan or a program of being held to only live mandates. Our mandates all expire with the completion of a term of Congress, so that we in the past, over many years, have had many similar mandates which do not exist at the present time.

Up until 2 years ago, they would have existed continuously. However, at the Miami convention in 1951, a resolution was passed that the mandate expire with the Congress unless it had become legislation.

Mr. CELLER. I still figure from what you tell me that the executive committee for the Americanism commission, or the subcommittee of which you are a member, go in a conclave and deliberate over this matter and it would be impossible between conventions to consult with all the departments. That is impossible; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, but they have representation.

Mr. CELLER. What we have here is a resolution adopted by the subcommittee of which you are a member, the Americanism commission, and the executive committee of the American Legion; is that right?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. CELLER. You say in your statement on page 4:

Remember, too, that the bulk of the young men who have gone off to war never held a job—they came from homes and schools—consequently they have no reemployment rights.

Are you aware that the labor organizations in this country, the CIO and the AFL, have approved these provisions concerning the admission of 240,000 refugees and also surplus population? Are you aware that they have approved these bills?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am aware of that.

Mr. CELLER. Are you aware also that they are jealous of the rights of their members to get jobs?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Congressman, these young men coming out of high school and going into the Korean war, to the rice paddies and mountain passes of Korea, they would have no jobs. They would have no connection with a labor union, as I see it.

Mr. CELLER. I know, but have you examined the newspapers to see the help-wanted ads recently?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; and invariably they call for skilled labor.

Mr. CELLER. I differ with you. You cannot get a chauffeur in New York. We cannot get domestics. There is a tremendous shortage of labor in my area. I am not speaking for the rest of the Nation. Look at the want ads in the Washington papers or in any metropolitan daily and you will see a plethora of help-wanted ads. It is impossible to get skilled or unskilled workers in most of the metropolitan areas, so that I do not see how any man returning from the war would be deprived of a job.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have 3½ million men in the service now, which may have some relationship to a scarcity of help at the present time.

Mr. CELLER. How many unemployed do we have in this country today?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not an expert here. We always have certain chronic unemployables.

Mr. GRAHAM. He comes here representing the American Legion. He does not pose as an expert on labor conditions.

Mr. CELLER. He makes a statement like that in his statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. We want to protect the witness.

Mr. CELLER. I want to protect the record and there are several statements in his prepared statement that there would be difficulty in getting jobs.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Congressman, if I might go back to the statement you made about the procedure of these mandates in the American Legion, our entire membership, through a monthly magazine, through our legislative bulletins, and through other mediums of disseminating the activities of the national organization of the Legion, is kept constantly acquainted with what is being done.

In reference to these particular mandates, I believe it was the March or April issue of the American Legion magazine that carried a very extensive article explaining the entire Legion nationally mandated policy to the membership of the American Legion regarding our position on the McCarran-Walter Act and related matters.

I have received a flood of mail, Mr. Congressman, indicating approval from the members of the American Legion and since we testified before the Senate committee some 2 weeks ago, I have received quite a lot of mail—it was carried apparently as a national story by the Associated Press—some in opposition, but the overwhelming majority, and not all from within the Legion, seems to be in favor of the American Legion's position in this matter.

Mr. CELLER. Can you possibly answer my question as to number of unemployed in this country today, not the chronic unemployed?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not have any idea because, as the chairman stated, I am not an expert on unemployment. Those figures should be available, Mr. Congressman, but I think we always have a certain amount of unemployment through chronic unemployables.

You cannot force a man to work in this free country. We could not get the displaced persons to stay on the farms. Congressman Walter knows that.

Mr. CELLER. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tell us that there are less unemployed today than ever in the history of this country.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question that.

Mr. CELLER. Out of the 240,000 that would come in, some would be old and some of them would be young; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; they would be of all ages.

Mr. CELLER. And there would be children amongst them?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true. Incidentally, Mr. Congressman, the American Legion has at no time taken exception to your bill to bring orphans into the United States. We would approve anything of that nature. If this problem was attacked from the standpoint of segments of the people, that is, from an age bracket, something of that nature, to bring in all of the orphans, all of the backwash of war that are orphans, we would say not over 16 years of age, not up to 21 years of age, but young enough to make good American citizens of them.

Mr. CELLER. Of the 240,000, a number would be children. They would not be unemployed, would they?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, they would not.

Mr. CELLER. Therefore, they would not militate against the chances of a veteran getting a job.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know how many there would be.

Mr. CELLER. Some of them would be old people and they would not because of their age militate against the veteran getting a position.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, but they would require housing.

Mr. CELLER. So it is not 240,000 that would come in and wrest away from those here who would be seeking a job. That is not quite correct.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Celler, will you yield for a moment to permit Miss Thompson to ask the witness about his viewpoint on the 25,000 Dutch refugees?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Miss THOMPSON. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not it is true that the American Legion has no objection to my bill which would admit 25,000 refugees from the Netherlands as a result of this disaster in the Netherlands?

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Congresswoman, the American Legion has not held an official session since your bill was introduced. At least, it was not brought to our attention in the last meeting at the end of last April. Just when was that introduced?

Mr. GRAHAM. Quite early in the year. It was March 17.

Miss THOMPSON. March 17. I have had considerable correspondence with members of the American Legion who have expressed themselves as being in favor of this bill and I may say for your benefit, to pass on to the members of your great organization, that we have a man appointed in this country who has taken the responsibility for placing these people when they do come into our country and that we have a sponsor for everyone of the 25,000 refugees.

We would not like, of course, any interference on the part of the American Legion in regard to our program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Your recommendation is one of meeting a disaster emergency, not the chain reaction continuing thing that we can never hope to get on top of because the increase in the population over there will overwhelm us. This is a particular emergency disaster relief and the American Legion is deeply conscious of the humanitarian aspects of things of that nature, the same as those embodied in this situation of these unfortunate people throughout Europe. However, we feel that as veterans of this country that our first duty is to our country

and the protection of men in our Armed Forces when they return to civil life, and the security of this Nation. We see a clear and present danger in the bringing in of these escapees from behind the Iron Curtain when it is completely and utterly impossible to screen them. They just cannot be screened. You must take a calculated risk, which is a very tricky thing. You can compress it or you can stretch it. It is a coverup expression.

Miss THOMPSON. It is my belief that many of these refugees coming in for temporary protection will eventually return to their country, but, as a matter of fact, there would be no expense involved to the American Government because they are all going to be taken care of by their own people.

I would like to pass that on to your organization.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will be very happy to bring that before the committee at our convention in St. Louis in August.

Miss THOMPSON. Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, may I introduce Col. Clarence Olsen, who is the assistant national legislative director of the American Legion. He is here in an advisory capacity with me and he would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will be glad to hear him.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that when Congressman Celler was asking the questions about the procedure in the American Legion, the thing was left up in the air to some extent. I would like to explain just a little bit if I might as to how it works.

When the resolutions are adopted, as they were in this case, by the department of Illinois, and referred to the standing commission of Americanism for the American Legion, and again by them to the subcommittee which Chairman Anderson heads, they were sent there for consideration to determine whether or not they approved, but their decision was not final. They simply from there make a recommendation to the American Legion's national convention or national executive committee, as the case may be. They may recommend approval or disapproval, but the act of doing either is left up to the governing bodies of the American Legion. The national executive committee in this case is an elected body provided for by the constitution of the American Legion.

Each member is elected from each department, from the State of New York, from Montana, wherever it may be, for a period of 2 years, much as the Congressmen are elected. They serve for that time and they speak for the people as a governing body between national conventions.

In this case, the governing body approved the resolutions that we were discussing. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. When the resolutions came before the Americanism commission, was there discussion?

Mr. ANDERSON. Indeed there was.

Mr. CELLER. Was there any minority report?

Mr. ANDERSON. There was no minority report.

Mr. CELLER. When it came before the Subcommittee on Immigration, was there discussion?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Was there any minority report?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Mr. CELLER. When the matter came before the executive committee was there any discussion?

Mr. ANDERSON. There was discussion on this resolution which I just read here. There was discussion on the part of the alternate national executive committeeman from Pennsylvania. In the absence of the national executive committeeman from Pennsylvania, it gave the alternate the right to the floor and this gentleman spoke and spoke very fervently and very capably, in opposition to the resolution as it was worded. He agreed with it in part, but not with all of it.

There was discussion among the national executive committeemen and he had no support whatever, that is, no oral support or voice support at least, from any other member of the national executive committee, which consists of 1 member from each of the 54 departments.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was given the opportunity to be heard and state his views?

Mr. ANDERSON. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. He had the absolute right to be heard; yes, sir; the same as any gentleman in the Congress has the right to be heard.

Mr. CELLER. This statement that you have read here this morning was not submitted to the national executive committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir. This statement was prepared with the cooperation of our national legislative commission headed by Mr. Jerry Duggan, a very capable lawyer of St. Louis, and the staff of the legislative commission, of which Colonel Olsen is the assistant legislative director.

Miles Kennedy is the director. They cooperated with your witness, the chairman of the Immigration Committee.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, that is the general policy of the Legion. The paid staff does not as a rule prepare the testimony to be offered in behalf of the American Legion. That is done by the volunteers who work in the various phases of the Legion program, but their testimony is confined to the mandates of the American Legion. We cannot formulate policy other than that which is handed down to us by our governing bodies.

Mr. ANDERSON. I might say for the record, Mr. Chairman, and I am claiming no credit or pride of authorship, that I wrote every word of this statement. It was submitted to the various gentlemen of authority that I have mentioned previously after I had completed the statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know Mr. Celler wishes to question you further, but I would like to say that we will conclude here at a quarter of 12. Could you confine your remarks to the next 5 or 10 minutes in order to enable the next witness to be heard?

Mr. CELLER. I want to question you with regard to the statement you make on page 3 in the middle thereof:

Should our investigators be 99 percent correct in their risky decisions, and wrong in the remaining 1 percent, it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present dangerous powder-keg situation.

Our immigration laws permit 150,000 to come in a year, roughly?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. It is estimated by Congressman Walter that there will be around 200,000 come in yearly under the quota system.



Mr. CELLER. You mean quota and nonquota, do you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. All right, let us say the figure is 200,000. The investigators of the constituted authorities that screen the 200,000 would be the same that would screen the 240,000 under these bills; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That I do not know. I am not certain. I heard Commissioner Mackey's testimony before the Senate committee which was holding hearings on the President's suggested bill and he was not certain at that time how the screening would be handled or what agencies would do it.

Mr. CELLER. The State Department and Department of Justice Immigration Service would under most of these bills do the screening.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true, if they are so delegated.

Mr. CELLER. They are the ones that do the screening under the Nationality and Immigration Code. That being so, the same authorities would screen in one case as in the other. If they are wrong 1 percent, then you have the possibility of having 2,000 spies come in, because we admit 200,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Congressman Celler, I specifically refer on this screening to the inability of them to have any source material on these 125,000 escapees and expellees.

It is utterly impossible to get back in Joe Blongviski's hometown wherever it may be behind the Iron Curtain, in Eastern Germany, Hungary, or Poland, and find out his background, his life history, or whom he associated with, not only from a subversive standpoint, but also from a criminal standpoint.

However, you do not see that objection raised pertaining to the nationals who are included in this bill, or the overpopulations. The American consul or our emissaries of the State Department can go to the hometowns. They can get the entire history and background of all of these people, and they still make mistakes.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, your point is that these people having lived in the Communist area, they may be so indoctrinated that they would be so skillful and cunning they would evade successfully the questions propounded to them by the screening authorities; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. We have a German quota of 25,000 a year, do we not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. If anybody comes into the consulate offices of West Berlin, having escaped from East Germany or East Berlin, he could come in under the German quota, could he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know what the application of that is.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, they could come in. Even if they had lived in East Germany or East Berlin, since they are German nationals, they could come in under the German quota, although they lived in those areas which were dictated by Communists and Kremlin authorities. You would have a danger there, would you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, you would have identically the same danger with that portion of the German quota as you would have with those who come from other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the committee

that under the Lodge amendment to the Selective Service Act, 12,500 escapees and expellees are permitted to enlist in the United States Army for a period of 5 years after which they would be granted expeditious citizenship. Two years have past since the Lodge amendment, and as of April 30, 1953, only 565 have enlisted. Either the United States Army considers the security risk too great or these people do not want to earn the right of asylum and citizenship in the United States, but prefer the easy way of admission. Meanwhile, our own boys are doing 95 percent of the fighting and dying in Korea and we are paying 95 percent of the bill.

The Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act, establishing units in the NATO armies, has been equally unsuccessful.

MR. CELLER. Therefore, if your argument was sound and you want to exclude for that reason these refugees generally, we would have to take the same position with reference to those East Germans or East Berliners who seek entrance into this country under the German quota.

MR. ANDERSON. There may be an exception there, Mr. Congressman, but these recently escaped people who have come over in an apparent mass defection from communism, most of them have not escaped furtively under cover of darkness by swimming rivers. They have crossed the street from East Berlin to West Berlin, something of that nature; many of them, I have been told by observers, in full view.

MR. CELLER. We prefaced our statement by the fact they lived in Communist-dominated countries.

MR. ANDERSON. As a weapon, one of his most potent weapons, the lie, they will swear to high heaven they detest communism. "Perhaps thou protesteth too much," said Shakespeare. On that basis they might brand them as communistic.

MR. GRAHAM. We want to thank you for appearing here. We will excuse you now and call the other witnesses.

We have received a telegram from Nicholas Korolkoff stating he is sorry he cannot come to testify. I will give that to the reporter.

(The telegram referred to follows:)

FARMINGDALE, N. J., June 8, 1953.

ROLAND ELLIOTT,  
Carroll Arms Hotel.

Sorry cannot come to testify.

NICHOLAS KOROLKOFF.

MR. GRAHAM. I wish to make the announcement now that tomorrow morning the hearings will be continued in Room 327, Old House Office Building, the room straight down the hall.

Mr. Babcock will be next.

#### STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. BABCOCK, ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES L. WILMETH, REPRESENTING THE JUNIOR ORDER OF UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS

MR. BABCOCK. My name is Charles E. Babcock. I live near Vienna, Va. I am chairman of the national legislative committee of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics.

This morning Mr. James L. Wilmeth is with me, former national secretary. I would like to have him sit beside me during the hearing.

MR. GRAHAM. That is all right.

Before beginning, may I give you this: We quit at a quarter to twelve. There is very important legislation on the floor. That gives you 25 minutes. So if you are unable to finish your oral statement, will you then submit anything you have in writing for the record?

Mr. BABCOCK. I have no oral statement. To read this will take only about between 10 and 15 minutes. I can read it rather fast if that is desired.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Junior Order United American Mechanics, through its legally constituted representatives, extends thanks to your honorable committee for the privilege of permitting its representatives to appear before you at the hearing on the subject of emergency legislation as recommended by the President to admit 240,000 immigrants and refugees to this country in the next 2 years.

The Junior Order United American Mechanics is now celebrating the 100th anniversary since its organization in 1853. It has been a consistent policy of this old patriotic fraternity to oppose the unlimited admission of aliens of foreign countries to the United States as immigrants. It has participated in the preparation of immigration and restriction measures during most of its existence as a fraternity. It took an active part in helping to secure legislation to suppress and stop the importation of contract laborers and immigrants; it assisted in the preparation of the immigration law of 1917; it was active in assisting in the Immigration Act of 1921 which first established quotas, and the act of 1924 when the quota system of immigration was enacted into law.

In connection with our present testimony on emergency legislation as recommended by the President to admit 240,000 immigrants and refugees, we call your attention to the statement submitted by representatives of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, May 22, 1952, when H. R. 7376 was under consideration, and to advise that our present statement and testimony will not be a repetition of that submission to your honorable committee but will be supplemental thereto.

The present emergency legislation under consideration proposes to bring in 240,000 immigrants known as escapees, expellees, and persons from overpopulated nations. Our fraternity is unalterably opposed to any such legislation and begs to submit its reasons therefor.

We do not believe that the classes of persons enumerated in the said emergency legislation of 240,000 immigrants are calculated to become useful law-abiding American citizens. It is certain that the services of this vast number of immigrants is not needed in our economy and the indications point strongly to the fact that there will be less need for them in the future and, certainly, if the truce and armistice negotiations in Korea are brought to a successful conclusion and our American soldiers brought back to their homes.

If such emergency legislation should become a law, it would be a positive step in the direction of the destruction of our immigration laws.

We think that the use of the name escapee is unfortunate. For instance, escapee may be applied to those who are fleeing from persecution and, on the other hand, it applies with equal force to those persons who have been guilty of a crime, or are persona non grata for cause.

While expellee carries with it the idea of those who are driven out for cause, it is generally considered as an opprobrious term. At any rate, it seems farfetched that the Congress of the United States should be pressured for legislation which it considers remedial or helpful, for persons who belong in either class. Official reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation disclose that an overwhelming percentage of people in this country who belong to the Communist Party were born of foreign parents, married to persons of foreign birth, and that something over half of them traced their origin either to Russia or her satellite countries.

We submit that those who will benefit by this emergency legislation, if enacted into law, should present positive evidence that they are now, and have always been clear of the taint of communism. We are fearful that if this emergency legislation becomes a law it will be adding to the troubles which we already have in this country by persons with subversive tendencies.

Overpopulation and the relief of it, as is proposed in this emergency legislation, sounds like something to be desired; but when we come to the cold facts of the situation in Italy, for instance, we find that the Communist Party has a large following and the United States has been adopting plans and purposes to assist the conservative Italian government to win the present election. It would be next to impossible to separate and cull out from a promiscuous Italian population those who are loyal to democratic doctrines and principles with so many Communist adherents present. This would add to our confusion and distraction and law enforcement.

The McCarran-Walter bill is hard on Communists who are attempting to gain admission to the United States, and is also tough on Communists here in this country who are trying to carry on their subversive doctrines and activities to avoid the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act as to their deportation.

If this emergency legislation should become a law, it would make an exception to the present quota system of regulating immigration. The people of the United States, with the exception of minority groups and liberals, are in favor of the McCarran-Walter Act. This present emergency legislation, as well as the displaced persons bill, destroys the legal quota system which experience has found to be a great safeguard to the American people in the matter of the admission of aliens.

What we desire is immigration under the selective and restrictive provisions of the quota system. Emergency legislation should not take the place of good, sound legislation which is the outgrowth of experience and which fully meets the needs of our American economy.

We do not need this mass immigration now, and we submit that it is not for the best interest of the people of America and especially the working people, to open the doors for this large influx of immigrants.

Heretofore, with the exception of the displaced persons bill, the Congress has avoided emergency legislation such as is now proposed. The displaced persons bill established a precedent which has been studiously followed in the Congress; so much so that we find during the 83d Congress that emergency legislation has been introduced which, if enacted into law, would bring in over 2 million undesirable, unneeded, and unwanted aliens.

In the Senate, bills have been introduced during the 83d Congress which would bring in 868,000 aliens under emergency legislation.

These are rather staggering figures and should cause the members of your honorable committee to stop, look, and listen before the President's emergency legislative program is accepted and approved.

In the matter of receiving alien immigrants from overpopulated countries, we submit that the pursuance of such a policy would finally lead to our own overpopulation here. It would test to the utmost our housing facilities, and the competition that these aliens would bring to our American working people would be ruinous. The best way to avoid such a situation is not to establish the policy of attempting relief of this kind. Taking up the excess population of other nations would result in one of the three following situations:

One, it would deprive our own citizens and especially our soldier boys of jobs that rightfully belong to them.

Two, in order to live they would have to have jobs or employment.

Three, without employment they will go on relief at the expense of the taxpayers.

It is only the privilege of an alien to receive a visa to be admitted into the United States, and not a right. His admission should be governed at all times by laws such as the McCarran-Walter Act and not by emergency legislation of this kind. Our own good comes first and should not be set aside or passed over by humanitarian reasons or considerations.

There are other features of this emergency legislation which, according to our views, are not well considered. Such as for instance, the coordinator with excessive powers; setting aside immigration fees established by law; loans as inducements for uprooted people and persons from overpopulated areas. Regulation of immigration devolves upon the Department of Justice. The coordinator is not a member of the Cabinet.

Therefore, it seems to our order that in the interest of sound administration, it would be far better if the coordinator should discharge the duties devolving upon him not as an independent officer but as an officer under the supervision and direction of the Department of Justice. This would avoid political pressures or favoritism in the matter of determining the status of all persons who would benefit by the provisions of such emergency legislation, if it should become a public law.

Since preparing the foregoing statement, H. R. 5450 has been introduced in the House of Representatives. By its terms this bill provides for the admission to the United States of 100,000 immigrants from Italy outside of quota restrictions during the 2 years beginning January 1, 1954, at the rate of 50,000 immigrants per year.

The same objections apply to this bill as to the President's emergency legislation to bring in 240,000 and especially that part of our statement which deals with overpopulated areas. The United States is not responsible for the overpopulation of Italy, nor for its unemployment, nor the high cost of living.

The situation which confronts Italy, except as to overpopulation, applies to our own citizens here in the United States and offers no reason or a valid excuse for the proposed legislation. We are unalterably opposed to this legislation and its setup of handling. We have the finest immigration law this country has ever had in its history, and its legal requirements should be strictly complied with.

We hope your honorable committee will look with disfavor when you take up for consideration H. R. 5450.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is there anything you wish to say?

Mr. WILMETH. With reference to overpopulation in Italy, I would like to state that one of the reasons for that condition is the prizes that Mussolini offered for large families, and I think you ought to take that into consideration.

A good deal depends on the election when the returns in Italy are counted. If the Communists win, we certainly will not want or require any relief of overpopulation of that class. If we relieve the other side, the regulars, we will be making way for rampant communism, and I think we ought to think about this carefully before anything is done. I mean especially the overpopulation, and from Italy, before your honorable committee acts.

Mr. GRAHAM. Speaking for the committee, those who are here and Mr. Walter who has gone out, we have served almost continuously for 8 or 10 years on this committee. All through the proceedings of the Displaced Persons Act and the other acts we have done what we thought was for the best interests of this country. Naturally, we differ in our viewpoints but you may be assured that what we are doing is, in our judgment, to the best interests of the country.

Mr. CELLER. Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, testified here and we have other data supporting what he said. He stated that the birth rate in Italy was lower than the birth rate in the United States.

Mr. WILMETH. With all due respect to him, our information is that Italy is one of the most prolific nations on the face of the earth.

Mr. CELLER. That is not the contention of Bedell Smith or the other records we have, that Italy has a lower birth rate than the United States, lower than France, and lower than most countries.

Mr. WILMETH. Mussolini's prize citizens are just coming into action.

Mr. CELLER. On page 3 of your statement you say:

This present emergency legislation, as well as the Displaced Persons Bill, destroys the legal quota system.

You are aware of the fact that the Displaced Persons Act contained a provision that for every one that came in, a quota number had to be deducted from the various quotas in various countries. You are aware of that?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Are you aware of the statement submitted by the American Federation of Labor and the statement submitted by the CIO this morning, both to the effect that they are not worried about the impact of 240,000 refugees and escapees and surplus populations coming into this country upon American labor?

Mr. BABCOCK. I did not hear that statement this morning. I have heard it before in previous hearings in the subcommittee.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was submitted in the form of a statement, not submitted orally.

Mr. BABCOCK. I heard Mr. Green make that statement in a previous hearing. Of course they are not bothered by it; they have such an ironclad hold on labor that nobody can get in if they do not want them in. If the alien tried to do a carpenter's job in this country,

the union will call a strike and put him out. They do not fear unemployment.

Mr. Congressman, 100 years ago statesmen were busy in this country developing territorial area for the United States for future growth. Thanks to them, we have reached a limit of territorial growth in this country. Now, this is a young nation as nations of the world go. It is the baby of all the big nations. There is nobody in this room who can remember a time when India and China were not overpopulated. All the countries get overpopulated.

I am informed by the Bureau of Education that we have approximately 2 million students graduating each year. That takes no recognition of the great mass of millions who leave school between the grades of the fourth grade and the junior-high grade. It does not take much of a calculation to figure that another 100 years from now your statesmen are going to be faced with this same problem of overpopulation.

I think that must have been recognized in the early part of this century when they enacted the quota system to control immigration, so that as the future people of the country grow, they can spread out and have a country to spread to which was given by statesmen 100 years.

We are looking to the statesmen of today to preserve the territory of the United States for the people of the next 100 or more years. We hope your committee will disapprove these emergency immigration laws largely for that reason.

Mr. CELLER. We have reached the edges of our physical frontiers, is that right?

Mr. BABCOCK. Practically; yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. There are cultural, spiritual, and scientific frontiers. Have we reached them?

Mr. BABCOCK. You have got to eat. You eat out of territory, not culture. That is the trouble with China.

Mr. CELLER. Have we reached those frontiers?

Mr. BABCOCK. No nation ever reaches that, sir. Rome thought they had reached it in the great days of Nero.

Mr. GRAHAM. Miss Thompson would like to ask a question.

Miss THOMPSON. I would like to ask the witness, What is the size of this organization you represent?

Mr. BABCOCK. Madam Congressman, that fluctuates. We take our figure every quarter. It is approximately 75,000. We are in 26 States and have 1,500 lodges or councils throughout those States.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will now include in the record several statements and if there is nothing more, we will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in room 327 of the Old House Office Building.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

WENTWORTH-BY-THE-SEA, PORTSMOUTH, N. H.,

May 21, 1953.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,

*House Office Building:*

Request you place following resolution adopted by the National Society of New England Women assembled in Portsmouth, N. H., in 40th congress before the House Judiciary Committee in executive session today:

*"Resolved,* That the 40th congress of the National Society of New England Women support the Immigration and Nationality Act together with its national-origins principle and quota system and careful screening process and oppose

crippling amendments or the admittance of aliens outside of the provisions of this act."

MADELENE D. LEETCH,  
*Legislative Chairman, National Society of New England Women.*

GENERAL BOARD OF EDUCATION—THE METHODIST CHURCH,  
*Nashville 2, Tenn., June 8, 1953.*

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. REED: I am writing relative to the matter of 240,000 visas to uprooted persons from other countries.

I have before me the testimony of Mr. Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director of the Department of International Justice and Good Will of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, relative to this problem.

I understand that committee hearings will be held on June 8. I understand, further, that you are concerned with this problem.

I want to support the statement which Mr. Van Kirk has made and to say that I trust you will give this matter your serious consideration.

My impression of the situation in Europe when I visited there 4 years ago was that some of the small countries of Europe, namely, Holland and Sweden, are doing a great deal more in proportion to their resources for the unfortunate people of Europe than is this country. I realize, of course, that we are farther removed from the situation and that persons in this country are not as keenly aware of the problem as are those living only across the border from a group of refugees. It does seem to me, however, that this country has a responsibility to these persons larger than we have assumed to date. I think it is notable the work that has been done in bringing displaced persons into this country. It would appear to me, however, that the legislation which President Eisenhower called for on April 22, namely, that 240,000 visas be issued to these groups, is reasonable.

I trust that legislation may be enacted which will permit these persons to enter this country and which will provide for a reasonable distribution of the visas to the various pressure areas.

Yours very truly,

DORIS DENNISON.

NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL,  
U. S. A. NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION,  
*New York 10, N. Y., June 10, 1953.*

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: Just a line to express to you the appreciation of Mr. Elliott and myself for your courtesies extended to us in connection with our appearance before the hearing of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee last Monday. I felt that the hearings were both intelligently and constructively conducted. My only personal regret was that factors over which no one had any control made it impossible for me to present the position of the agencies I represented as clearly as might have been wished.

There is one particular point I should like to mention in further clarification, and for that reason I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to Congressmen Celler and Walter. Because of the pressure under which I summarized I did not seem to make clear to members of your committee the very important point that since our agencies do not believe that the problems of surplus populations can be or should be handled properly by emergency legislation—since they are recurring situations arising from factors which should be taken into consideration in the regular immigration laws of our country—they would hope that the total number of 240,000 places would be allotted for the needs of refugees whose circumstances are nonrecurring, we certainly hope, and are most certainly abnormal. Such a number would be only a token in regard to the total refugee need, but would be a fairly adequate token. We believe that the numbers allotted for refugees under the wording of the present bill represent an inadequate token in the perspective of the international responsibility for the solution of the refugee problem.



Mr. Elliott has already written you about the point of the needs of the Dutch for relief from their surplus population problem. They indeed have our sympathy as do the Italians. However, to combine problems of this nature with the special needs of refugees for which emergency legislation is necessary seems unwise and unsound. Our agencies have gone on record as stating that the issues are different and should be faced separately. All of this point of view was stated explicitly or by implication in our statement, but I felt it might be worth while to be sure that there be no misunderstanding about it.

With best wishes, I am,  
Cordially yours,

PAUL C. EMPIE,  
*Executive Director.*

---

STATEMENT BY MERWIN K. HART, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y., RE SENATE BILL 1917

A Federal grand jury of New York City reporting September 21, 1943, after it had heard the testimony of several hundred witnesses, suggested, according to the New York Times of September 22, 1943, that immigrants be admitted only on grounds in which the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant.

It recommended further that immigrants be restricted to those, likely to contribute directly or indirectly to the welfare of the country and who may be readily assimilated as citizens.

Acting on authoritative statements such as the above, but only after the bars had been let down and hundreds of thousands of immigrants had been allowed to enter the country, the Senate Judiciary Committee commenced, 5 or 6 years ago, a revision and codification of the immigration laws.

The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, which this pending bill would largely undermine, certainly reflected the sober thought of the Congress, and I believe, of the vast majority of the people. The fact that it was repassed over the President's veto has great significance. The people spoke through their representatives in Congress, just as they had spoken 9 years before through the presentment of that Federal grand jury in New York City.

Immediately after the final passage of the McCarran-Walter Act, propaganda was turned loose throughout the country to undo what the Congress of the United States had so ably done. President Truman's hastily appointed committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Philip Perlman, and with the assistance of Mr. Harold N. Rosenfield, to investigate immigration in a few weeks' time (the Congress having consumed 5 years in doing just this), could not possibly have accomplished any constructive work in the time available to it. It was merely the opening gun in the effort to tear down the immigration gates.

A measure of the extent of the propaganda behind the attempts to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act is the fact that presently the President was persuaded to recommend to the Congress the admittance of 240,000 refugees, in addition to those authorized by existing law. I am sure that it escaped his notice that by this recommendation he was asking the Congress to stultify itself. For if ever the Congress gave thought to a bill before passing it, it was in connection with the McCarran-Walter Act.

The National Economic Council is wholly opposed to this bill or to any bill that changes the McCarran-Walter Act, directly or indirectly, unless and until experience has shown that such changes are necessary.

Our reasons are as follows:

1. The country has a public debt of some 260 billion, a national budget of around 70 billion. Most States and municipalities have large public debt and heavy taxes. By this burden initiative is further discouraged and our continued existence as a free republic is threatened.

In more ways than one we have for a generation been mortgaging our country's future. The country is already in a very real sense overcommitted. Perhaps not overcommitted to those who think our resources are without limit. But certainly overcommitted from the standpoint of national prudence and common sense. We are committed to go to the defense of many countries, should they be attacked. We have given or loaned them many billions of dollars; and our present policy is to continue to subsidize them. Beyond this, we have taken many hundreds of thousands of aliens into this country, and among those admitted have unquestionably been many Communists. All these facts contributed to persuade the Congress to pass the McCarran-Walter Act.

Beyond this we are told by the recent Massachusetts Institute of Technology report that we have got to spend even more heavily if we are to bring about a real protection of this country against bombing assault from without. We need also to tighten up against assault from within.

Recently administration officials made the disappointing announcement that taxes could not be reduced this year and that it would be most difficult to balance the national budget—even though certain European countries we are helping generously, such as Britain, France and others, are reducing their taxes. It has even been reported that the debt limit would have to be raised over its present level of 275 billion.

Yet, in the face of these tremendous commitments and threatened additional burdens, this pending bill recommends an initial appropriation of \$10 million; and it is a certainty that if the bill is passed, substantial additions would be made to the bureaucracy which the taxpayers of the country are already supporting. One of the reasons taxes can't be reduced is that we are threatened with fresh spending projects, such as this very measure.

2. We have not got the housing in this country to take in any considerable number of additional people. Recently the House threw out a provision for 35,000 additional housing units, but on May 6 the Senate Appropriations Committee put it back in the budget. Apparently the committee feels that more housing is needed for people already in America.

3. There is now considerable unemployment and this is likely to increase. Therefore, there would not be jobs for any great number of immigrants, unless some of those presently employed were dropped to make way for them, which was done when so many aliens were admitted during and just after the last war.

4. There has been a high degree of fraud and deceit in the past in connection with an immigration policy that has permitted large numbers of aliens to enter this country. On January 6, 1950, Senator McCarran who, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee had recently returned from Europe, reported that the facts he had learned, "point to the inescapable conclusion that the flood gates of this Nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens, from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons."

Senator McCarran further reported "inadequate screening of applicants with little or no regard to background, political beliefs, and predilections of applicants \* \* \*."

He said:

"My investigation has brought to light innumerable instances of wholesale fraud, misrepresentation, fictitious documents, and perjury resorted to by persons seeking displaced-persons status in order to qualify within the terms of the law."

The Senator further said that "the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock."

The practice of deceit and fraud in the admission of aliens was well illustrated by the case of 984 refugees unlawfully brought into the United States by President Roosevelt during the early days of World War II and interned in the so-called Fort Ontario refugee shelter at Oswego, N. Y. Since Mr. Roosevelt had no authority to do this he merely informed the Congress of the fact accomplished. It was asserted then that they would be returned to Europe after the war; but no sooner had they been settled in the Oswego camp than a propaganda move began to see that they were kept here. And they were kept here.

Finally, we are opposed to this bill because it seems to be chiefly backed by an alien element as fanatical and as dangerous as the Communists themselves, and just as determined as the Communists to complete a stranglehold on this country.

We in the economic council have learned by experience that this element will stop at nothing to secure their ends. No better illustration could be cited than the murder of Count Bernadotte because he failed to recommend a settlement satisfactory to them.

Our position toward all American Jews, including the Zionists, as well as toward all persons of any other religion or race, is that they are entitled to the privileges of all Americans—but no more. But the Zionists people are trying to seize more privileges.

Our position appears to be identical with that of a great majority of Jews. Many of this majority are represented by the American Council for Judaism, whose president is Lessing J. Rosenwald. Members of this latter organization go

on the principle that the first duty of American Jews is toward America. Their religion is secondary to their citizenship obligations.

On the other hand, the Zionists' viewpoint is that the first duty of American Jews is toward political Zionism. Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive director of the American Council for Judaism, according to the New York Times of May 11, 1953, had the previous day "denounced what he termed the Zionist concept that anyone not friendly to Israel was anti-Semitic."

It is our observation that the tremendous propaganda back of this bill to admit 240,000 aliens comes from the Zionists. This is shown by the high pressure propaganda of the Zionists themselves, of which Members of Congress are well aware. For some reason, the Zionists have strong reasons for favoring its passage. Obviously they expect that persons in sympathy with Zionism will be the chief beneficiaries if the bill is enacted.

Senator McCarran in his statement in the Senate on January 6, 1950, said: "One pressure group has, during the course of the last 3 years, registered with the Clerk of the House of Representatives lobbying expenditures of approximately \$1 million. This money has not, of course, been spent for the relief of displaced persons but solely for dissemination of propaganda designed to influence legislation to repeal the safeguards of our immigration laws. \* \* \*"

He also said in this statement:

"Of the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons who were admitted into the United States during the war years, it is reliably estimated that approximately four-fifths were of the Jewish faith."

The Zionist pressure to obtain their ends is directed against all Americans, but it is particularly directed against those Jews, undoubtedly a majority, that are non-Zionist.

Thus, Mr. William Zukerman, editor of the Jewish Newsletter, writing in the New York Herald Tribune of October 19, 1951, said in part:

"In some mysterious manner, Israel is supposed to have a unique jurisdiction over the 10 million to 12 million Jews who live in every country of the world outside it."

Later in this same article Mr. Zukerman said:

"When Mr. Ben-Gurion was in the United States last spring, he created something of a sensation by telling a gathering of Zionist leaders at the Waldorf-Astoria that unless they settled in Israel, they could not honestly call themselves Zionists."

A study of the remarks of many Zionists and of many non-Zionist Jews shows clearly that there is here in the United States a relatively small group, who are determined to build up the Zionist State of Israel, at whatever cost to the well-being of the American people. It was clearly they who prodded President Truman into persuading the Assembly of the United Nations to pass its resolution to partition Palestine, thereby precipitating a bloody war, and costing America the hundred-year friendship of the Arabs and the good will of 350 million Moslems. It was clearly they who were responsible for the Morgenthau plan in Germany, followed by the war-criminal trials and the dismantling of German plants. It is clearly they who recently persuaded the West German Government to agree to pay the State of Israel \$800 million of materials over a period of 10 years.

It is clearly these Zionists who are back of this bill to bring in 240,000 aliens (110,000 of them from the German area) in the next 2 years. They want this additional number of Jews to take under their control and domination, so that they can more surely intimidate this country into doing their will.

Mr. Winston Churchill openly calls himself a Zionist, apparently overlooking the fact that of all British subjects he should be the first to give undivided allegiance to his own country.

There was much comment when last January Mr. Churchill, visiting this country, and President-elect Eisenhower had their daily conferences, not at some public place, but in the home of Mr. Bernard Baruch. Newspapers on the eastern seaboard have long spoken of Mr. Baruch as "an adviser of Presidents." But each time he has advised our Presidents, we have got into war.

Our departure in 1917 from the advice of Washington in his Farewell Address, turned out tragically in the long run. It would have been better for us—and for the world—if we had stayed out of World War I. The same is true of World War II—for if we had stayed out there would have been no Yalta and no Potsdam—and incidentally no Korean war with its tragic outcome today.

This Zionist influence has been an evil influence on America. It may even have been the cause of many of the tragic ills that have befallen us.

It is, I believe, the influence back of this bill, on which this hearing is being held. The Zionists, determined to rule or ruin, both over other Jews and over

non-Jews, are counting on intimidating sufficient Members of this Congress to pass it.

I have heard it said that the White House has acquiesced in this bill on the theory that because of backing it, they can refuse further demands from the same source. But the result would be quite the contrary.

It is characteristic of the Zionists that they will attempt to wreak vengeance on all persons, including candidates for office, who do not knuckle down completely to their every demand. Some of the Members of this Congress have felt this attempted vengeance, or will feel it. But, in America's vital interests, a peremptory refusal of such a bill as this is the only course that should be followed.

As that grand jury said in 1943, "The paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, and that of the immigrant."

It is time we turned and resisted the evil influences that have brought upon us the ills of the past 36 years.

When in 1941 we were forced into World War II, although the polls showed right up to December of that year that some 80 percent of the people were opposed to our entrance, we abandoned the idea of America First. All good Americans rallied to their country's defense and 300,000 of them laid down their lives.

During those war years aliens were brought in in large numbers into America, many of them to take the good jobs of Americans who had gone out to fight and die.

The principle of America First had been succeeded by the principle of "America Last."

It is my opinion, based upon past experience, that if this pending bill were to pass, it would be but the beginning of a whittling away of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Soviet Russia has doubtless intentionally permitted the recent and current escape of many refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Are we to permit Soviet Russia to control our policy, so that any time she chooses to let a few thousand escape to the West, that is to constitute a "crisis," which will compel us to upset one of our fundamental policies?

In our opinion, this bill ought not to pass.

---

[From the Economic Council Letter, published semimonthly by the National Economic Council, Inc. (Council Letter No. 313, June 15, 1953)]

### WHY SABOTAGE IMMIGRATION POLICY?

Senate bill 1917, sponsored by Senator Watkins, of Utah, and 17 other Republican Senators, provides for the emergency admission into this country of 240,000 European aliens over and above those permitted by the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952.

It was apparently introduced under pressure from the White House, which itself under great pressure from certain elements in the United States.

The bill is dangerous to the security of this country and should be defeated.

Unlike other countries, down to 1924 America let in practically any foreigner who wanted to come. Most of the immigration, before 1890, was from northern Europe—Britain, Scandinavia, Germany, etc. After 1890 the immigration from central and southern Europe grew heavier. Many of these immigrants were looking for a new life and became loyal American citizens. But others came to bring in alien ideas. From them have come most of the revolutionaries we have had—the agitators, Socialists and Communists.

So the Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1924 which restricted immigration from any country to a fixed percent. That percent for each nation was the part that the immigrants from that nation—from the founding of the United States down to and through the figures of the census of 1920—bore to total immigration during that period.

Our immigration laws remained generally similar for a quarter century, though there were constant attempts to whittle them away. In 1948, under an avalanche of propaganda, the so-called Displaced Persons Act was passed which permitted the entrance of several hundred thousand aliens from central Europe.

On January 6, 1950 Senator McCarran, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said with regard to the operation of this act, that the facts he had learned on a recent trip to Europe "point to the inescapable conclusion that the floodgates of this Nation are being pried open for the entrance of millions of aliens from the turbulent populations of the entire world, who are seeking admission into the United States under the guise of displaced persons."

He said, further: "My investigation has brought to light innumerable instances of wholesale fraud, misrepresentation, fictitious documents, and perjury resorted to by persons seeking displaced-persons status in order to qualify within the terms of the law."

He also said—"the Attorney General of the United States recently testified that an analysis of 4,984 of the more militant members of the Communist Party in the United States showed that 91.4 percent of the total were of foreign stock or were married to persons of foreign stock."

### *McCarran-Walter Act*

In 1952, at the direction of the Congress and under the leadership of Senator McCarran of Nevada and Representative Francis Walter of Pennsylvania, both Democrats, an exhaustive 4 years' investigation was completed, and, the McCarran-Walter Act, officially known as the Immigration and Nationality Act, was passed and repassed over President Truman's veto. Naturally it was thought that the policy so labouriously worked out in the Congress had become settled—until time and experience should show amendment to be advisable.

But such was not the case.

No sooner had the McCarran-Walter Act been passed than President Truman appointed a commission to study immigration and recommend changes in the law. This commission held hearings in various parts of the country with wide publicity in the liberal and left-wing press.

On April 22d of this year President Eisenhower wrote Speaker Martin and Vice President Nixon urging the admission of 240,000 immigrants above the quotas set forth in the McCarran-Walter Act. The letter said nothing about the interests of the United States. It merely dwelt on the supposed needs of the peoples of other countries. It spelled out one of these many "crises," with which we became so familiar from 1933 to 1952.

It ignored, for instance, the recommendation of a Federal grand jury of New York City on September 21, 1943—after taking the testimony of several hundred witnesses—that in the future immigrants should be admitted only on grounds in which "the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant."

In his letter, the President urged we had a duty to humanity to pass this bill. He said also that "international political considerations are also factors."

But that was what we were told when the heat was on to pass the Displaced Persons Act in 1948. In fact, most of the tragic mistakes of the past 20 years have come from letting other nations fix our policy. Isn't it time we quit?

### *The Watkins bill*

Following the above-mentioned letter, the Administration, as well as alien elements, went to work on the Congress with the result that on May 15 the 18 Republican Senators introduced this pending Watkins Bill which would effectively undermine the McCarran-Walter Act.

President Eisenhower's letter said that he wished his proposal to be carried out "within the framework of the immigration laws." But it's not within this framework—it violates it.

It has been asserted that the Watkins bill is not an amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act, but in several respects it is just that. For instance, the Watkins bill sets up a "Coordinator" and makes that Coordinator the superior of the Executive Officers of the Bureaus whose employees the Coordinator seeks to utilize. That will surely create friction.

Moreover the admission of these 240,000 immigrants would inevitably bring about the displacement of American citizens from their jobs—just as happened after the passage of the Displaced Persons Act in 1948. The pending bill allows each prospective immigrant to bring with him "adopted children" and "step-children"—any number of them; although experience of past years demonstrates that the inclusion of those words is conducive to fraud and misrepresentation. The Watkins bill is, in fact, a body blow at a well settled policy established by the Congress.

The first line of the Constitution, following the preamble, says: "All legislative power herein granted, shall be vested in a Congress. \* \* \*" But the pressure now being put upon the Congress ignores in spirit this vital clause of the Constitution.

### *Why American system has worked well*

One of the greatest features of the American Government, a feature new in history and one that has worked well, is the doctrine of the "separation of powers" and the companion doctrine of "checks and balances." James Madison said that

the consolidation of legislative, executive and judicial powers is the essence of tyranny. That's why the Founding Fathers separated them. The fact they separated them is a reason why the American Government has worked so well.

The alien elements now trying, by force applied behind the scenes, to compel the Congress to reverse its well-considered Immigration Act of 1952, are a menace to America.

Recently newspapers published a list of "must legislation." This really means that the Executive is telling the Congress, a coordinate branch of the Government, what it must do. We never heard of "must legislation" prior to 1933. We hoped we would never hear of it after 1952.

#### *Why Watkins bill should be defeated*

There are urgent reasons why the Watkins bill should be defeated.

For one thing, the country already has a public debt of 260-odd billions and a national budget of around 70 billions. Most States and municipalities are burdened with debts and taxes. It would cost the Government many millions to bring in these additional immigrants, in addition to the fact that it would be certain to bring in large numbers of communists and spies. It would tend to overload the Eastern European element.

For 20 years our Government has been mortgaging the country's future. We have long since become overcommitted and overextended, not only financially but morally. We are now stupidly refusing adequately to reduce our spending and our taxes, while Britain, France, and other countries, to whom we are still giving vast sums, are reducing theirs. As in 1933-52, alien influence is still far too strong in Washington.

The Senate has authorized 35,000 additional housing units—presumably for persons already here. Obviously we would not have sufficient housing for the proposed 240,000 newcomers.

In certain sections of the country there is now considerable unemployment. It is possible we will enter a depression and have greater unemployment—and we are already ill-prepared for that.

When in 1941 we were forced into World War II, although the polls showed right up to December of that year that some 80 percent of the people were opposed to our entrance, we abandoned the idea of America first. All good Americans rallied to their country's defense and 300,000 of them laid down their lives.

During those war years aliens were brought in in large numbers, many of them to take the good jobs of Americans who had gone out to fight and die. Are we to repeat this performance now?

Under the influence of an extremely vocal minority, the principle of America First has been succeeded by the principle of America Last.

It is our opinion, based upon past experience, that if this pending bill were to pass, it would be but the beginning of a whittling away of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Without serious doubt, Soviet Russia has intentionally permitted the recent and current escape of many refugees from behind the Iron Curtain.

Are we to permit Soviet Russia to control our policy, so that any time she chooses to let a few thousand escape to the West, we are to have a "crisis"? And is minority pressure then to compel us to upset one of our fundamental policies?

#### *Settled congressional policy: should not be sabotaged*

If past experience can be trusted, what the President's advisers have persuaded him to ask for is sabotage of the carefully thought-out McCarran-Walter Act. Since many of those escaping under the Iron Curtain (undoubtedly with Communist connivance) are Communists, a large part of the 120,000 Central Europeans the bill prescribes will be Communists. They cannot be screened—for how can our authorities get reliable information since they cannot get to the homeland of applicants, and find out?

And since at least 1 person in 5 in Italy is a Communist, can we expect to bring in 75,000 Italians, as prescribed in the bill, without bringing in many Communists?

The Watkins bill is not in the interest of America. It is in the interest of certain European groups that seek to secure control of America.

Let the Watkins bill pass and presently it will be harder to pass any future bill whose purpose is to preserve America.

The two Democratic administrations of 1933-53 made criminal mistakes in foreign and domestic policy.

Is the Eisenhower administration to add one more?

It is known that many Senators are against the Watkins bill. It is doubtful whether all of the 18 would have joined in introducing it, if pressure had not been used.

It is time for citizens to speak up and give their two Senators the benefit of their views. Already many citizen groups, notably the American Legion, the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, have come out against it.

We urge every one of our readers without delay, to tell his two Senators what he thinks they should do about this. They will welcome his views.

The matter is urgent. Time is of the essence.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.,  
MERRWIN L. HART, *President*.

NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC.,  
Washington 9, D. C., June 11, 1953.

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*United States House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. REED: I have the honor to transmit herewith, requesting your consideration, a resolution opposing the enactment of S. 1917—83d Congress—or other similar legislation, which was adopted by National Sojourners at the 33d Annual Convention in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 22, 1953.

National Sojourners, Inc., composed of 203 active chapters, distributed throughout the United States and its possessions and at certain other places abroad, is an organization of Master Masons who are citizens of the United States and who are now serving, or have served, as commissioned or warrant officers of the United States, or of an allied country in time of war.

Among the purposes of National Sojourners are the development of true patriotism and Americanism throughout the Nation and the opposing of any influence whatsoever calculated to weaken the national security. Based upon these purposes, the resolution, a copy of which is enclosed, was unanimously adopted by National Sojourners at the recent annual convention in Los Angeles, as aforesaid.

Respectfully yours,

MERRITT B. CURTIS,  
*National Secretary.*

#### RESOLUTION No. 11

#### RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE ENACTMENT OF S. 1917, 83D CONGRESS, OR OTHER SIMILAR LEGISLATION

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act effected a much-needed codification and improvement of our immigration and naturalization laws and established a system of quotas for immigration; and

Whereas National Sojourners, Inc., in convention assembled in the city of Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952, adopted resolution No. 9, supporting the legislation which became the McCarran-Walter Act; and

Whereas there was introduced in the Senate on May 15, 1953, a bill, S. 1917, entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas the said bill S. 1917, would, if enacted, create an exception to the quota immigration system, established by the McCarran-Walter Act; and

Whereas the enactment of the bill, S. 1917, would, in the opinion of National Sojourners, Inc., be detrimental to the best interests of our citizens, by permitting entrance into the United States of persons possibly with ideologies at variance with our constitutional system of government which could constitute a threat to our security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 33d annual convention, at Los Angeles, Calif., on May 22, 1953, That, for the purpose of protecting the interests of all of our citizens, by excluding persons with ideologies at variance with our constitutional systems of government; it opposes the enactment of S. 1917, or any other legislation which would, at this time, in any substantial degree modify, change, or in any way make exceptions to the quota immigration system established by the McCarran-Walter Act; and be it further*

*Resolved*, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 4, 1953.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee,  
 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

The Polish-American Congress which unites 6 million Americans of Polish descent and which has organized as its affiliate the American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons wishes to express its wholehearted approval of President Eisenhower's recommended admission of 240,000 immigrants above quotas to relieve the refugee problem in Western Europe and to ease the problem of overpopulation. In our opinion we deem it necessary that the following suggestions be taken into consideration for an equitable solution of the problem.

There are a great number of displaced persons in Germany who failed to complete processing before the expiration date of the Displaced Persons Act in January 1952. Among these the Polish refugees are in very difficult straits at the mercy of the German authorities who have their hands full with their own surplus population problems. The number of 15,000 proposed in most of the bills for refugees is not adequate to relieve the refugees and escapees living within nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and within Turkey. We further recommend that Sweden should be included in the European countries covered by emergency immigration legislation. Because that country has the largest group of political refugees. Any emergency immigration should include a fair number of Polish soldiers of the former Polish Army in exile who for various reasons failed to register in time their intent to emigrate to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act as amended. Eighteen thousand former Polish soldiers were eligible to come to America but only 10,300 were able to take advantage of the privilege. In conclusion we suggest that a provision should be made for the relief of the refugees who are already residing in the United States but who for various reasons have been unable to adjust their immigration status. Our concern applies to both those who arrived here legally and those who are in our country illegally seeking political asylum. Our affiliate voluntary agency, the American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons, is still in existence and ready to perform all assigned functions to help in the resettlement of the new refugees who will come to our country upon passage of a new emergency immigration act.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS,  
 CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President*.

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,  
 Washington 6, D. C., June 6, 1953.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization,  
 Committee on the Judiciary, House Office Building, Washington D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: Although we were unable to testify during public hearings on the President's proposal to authorize the issuance of some 240,000 special immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of such countries as Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, we respectfully request consideration of our views relative to this general subject of emergency legislation to take care of the special migration needs of the dislocated people of World War II and thereafter.

Although we are not in a position to comment on the various bills and proposals before your subcommittee, particularly as to specific provisions regarding numbers and administrative matters, we do wish to go on record as endorsing the general principle that our United States should assume the leadership in resolving as best it can the worldwide population problems which are an aftermath of World War II. The least we can do, it seems to us, is to accept our fair share of the burden, consistent of course, with out internal security and political, economic, and social realities of the day.



If this proposed legislation is to be used to lessen postwar migration tensions, to aid the refugees and escapees of totalitarian tyranny and to serve as an effective weapon in the psychological warfare against the Communist conspiracy by truly reflecting our national concern for the distressed and dislocated of earth, it seems to us that it is conspicuously deficient in that it makes no provisions for the war-weary Far East.

At the moment, we are engaged in a worldwide struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In this vital struggle, when Asia is the actual fighting battleground, it seems dangerous that we should, in national emergency legislation, indicate our greater concern for Europe than we do for the Orient. We are not suggesting that Europe is less important, but we are saying that Asian problems are more urgent by the very nature of the struggle there.

With specific reference to the subject matter of the President's proposed legislation, may we call to the attention of Congress that there are far more people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain in Asia than there are in Europe.

Too, we understand that in the free countries and ports of the Far East there are far more refugees and escapees from Soviet domination than in all of free Europe. An unofficial estimate given us places more than a million escapees from Communist China in Hong Kong alone, while in South Korea we are told that there are at least 3 times as many, or more than 3 million refugees. This does not take into account the thousands of captured prisoners of war of the United Nations in Korea who have refused repatriation to Red China or North Korea, or the thousands of American-educated Chinese and Koreans who are unable to return to their homelands because alien ideologies have taken over their respective countries, or the hundreds of thousands on Formosa who escaped from behind the Bamboo Curtain, or the millions of refugees who have found asylum in Southeast Asia.

As to repatriation at war's end, which has swelled the already overcrowded population of a defeated nation, we call attention to Japan which had to accept more than 5 million nationals from Manchuria, China, and other Asian and Pacific areas following the surrender in 1945.

These examples should serve to establish the necessity for the same type of remedial legislation for Asia as is presently proposed only for Europe.

There is the even more compelling reasons that obvious discrimination against an Asia in restless ferment in this critical period may cause irreparable damage to our leadership of the free nations of the Orient, where most of the peoples of the world reside, where the balance of power in the struggle for survival may well rest.

Cognizant of these facts which may prove decisive, last June the Congress enacted the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 and provided therein for the first time in American history equality of consideration and opportunity for immigration and naturalization privileges for all peoples without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. Numerical limitations were placed upon immigration but the important principle of the equal recognition of peoples was written into our Federal statutes. This was a historic forward step in our international relations and gained for us as a nation probably more goodwill among more people than any other single congressional or government action of recent times, for it exemplified the sincerity of our democratic professions.

Now, 1 year later, in considering the first major immigration matter since the 1952 act, we appear to be reverting to that anti-Asian philosophy which resulted in the Oriental Exclusion Acts of 1924. These obviously discriminatory statutes, according to many historians, were a primary cause of World War II in the Pacific.

By confining the benefits of this legislation to Europe, we are contradicting our salutary actions of a year ago and are once again slamming the door in the faces of the proud peoples of Asia by refusing to give them equal consideration in a matter which concerns all mankind, everywhere—not just those in Europe. Let us not repeat the mistake of 1924, lest World War III be the possible tragic end.

As the only national organization representing Americans of Japanese ancestry in the United States, the Japanese American Citizens League respectfully urges the Congress to give serious study to the migration and population problems of Asia. We earnestly urge this action as Americans primarily interested in the future well-being of our United States because we believe that by such consideration our Nation will retain and increase the good will which we now enjoy throughout the Far East as the champions of freedom and independence. Such consideration, expressed in remedial legislation, may well do more than military supplies or even gifts of food to convince these peoples who are rightfully suspicious of all

Western Powers that we truly desire their friendship and cooperation in the common cause of peace with dignity and freedom.

We recognize, of course, that the population problems of the universe, aggravated by World War II and the more recent Soviet imperialism, cannot be resolved by the United States alone. But we are, nevertheless, of the conviction that this country can make a significant contribution to easing at least part of the tensions by inviting as many uprooted persons as we can safely admit to come to this land to begin anew disrupted lives, thereby showing the way to other free nations that are also capable to invite war victims to their respective shores.

Our invitations should be based upon the practical consideration of our own ability to reasonably assimilate these peoples, for this is only temporary emergency legislation and certainly not the answer to the surplus-population question in a world of restricted immigration.

The problem of population pressures is worldwide, with worldwide implications. It cannot be solved by any one nation alone; it can be solved only by all the free nations working in concert to devise a long-range humane program.

The President's proposal, which is now under consideration, is not directed to a permanent solution; it is only an emergency measure suggested to aid a temporarily acute situation and to regain the initiative in the struggle to demonstrate concern for all peoples everywhere. As such, the JACL endorses its principles with the reservation that it be amended to include uprooted and dislocated peoples everywhere, including Asia, not only as a matter of equality and justice but also in our own enlightened self-interest of refusing to take deliberate action which will alienate unnecessarily any free people anywhere.

There is a final problem which the JACL desires to call to the attention of the Congress; this has to do with people already in the United States who are the little known but outstanding examples of war's dislocation.

We refer to the strange case of several hundred Peruvian Japanese who were brought into the United States by this Government at the request of Peru and interned here during the war under an inter-American defense arrangement. Many of these stranded are citizens of Peru, either by naturalization or by birth; all are legal residents of that South American Republic. Without charges of any kind against them, and without distinction as to their possible danger to that nation, these Peruvian Japanese were uprooted from their homes and shipped to this country, where they were confined with enemy aliens interned by our Department of Justice as a precautionary measure.

Even during the war, they were recognized as the unfortunate victims of wartime prejudice and greed. They were paroled to work on the farms and in the factories, contributing to the production which led to victory. After the war, they were given releases and have scattered to all parts of the country because they cannot return to Peru. Their own country for reasons never made public refuses to accept them.

Some now have American-born children.

Though brought into this country against their will by the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has ruled that they are now in the United States illegally and, therefore, must be deported. Since Peru will not accept them, they are subject to deportation to Japan, a country many of them have never seen.

Our Government, embarrassed by this unprecedented situation, has authorized suspension of deportation for them under the usual procedures promulgated by the Attorney General. Congress, unaware of this unique situation, has not approved all of the cases submitted for their consideration in the past several years. And, in cases where suspension has been approved, they have been charged to Japan's future quotas.

While we believe that these Peruvian Japanese are entitled to suspension of deportation proceedings and adjustment of status to that of resident aliens, we contend that charging them to Japan's quota is grossly unfair. Under the national origins formula of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Japan has an annual quota of only 185. Since this is the first year that even this small number has been made available to the Japanese, it has already been oversubscribed for many years with hundreds of thousands waiting for a chance to enter the United States. Many of these applicants are entitled to preferences within the quotas because of family ties in the United States.

If, as is being done under existing law, every suspension of deportation for a Peruvian Japanese is charged to Japan's future quotas up to 50 percent each year, Japan's quota for the next 30 to 35 years will be reduced to 92 or 93 annually, that is assuming that there are approximately between 250 and 300 Peruvian

Japanese left in the United States awaiting suspension of their deportation proceedings.

We do not believe that Congress, in extending the token quota of 185 to Japan annually, intended that it be mortgaged for the next 3 decades and reduced to 92 or 93 a year because of a wartime mistake which has resulted in tragedy for a number of Japanese brought to the United States from Peru.

Accordingly, we request that in this special emergency legislation to aid the uprooted of World War II a section be added to authorize these Peruvian Japanese, if otherwise qualified, to remain in the United States as permanent residents if they so desire and that their numbers not be charged to the Japanese quota, that they be considered nonquota immigrants for purposes of the immigration law or that they be considered as having been issued special visas outside of Japan's regular quota.

We understand that a special provision was written into the original Displaced Persons Act to provide for almost 2,000 European refugees brought into the United States by President Roosevelt and quartered during the war at the emergency refugee shelter at Oswego, N. Y. Thus, since a precedent has already been set for such action to take care of the unfortunate victims of war, we urge that Congress write into the pending legislation remedial provisions to give nonquota immigration status to these Peruvian Japanese.

Sincerely,

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,  
MIKE M. MASAOKA,

*Washington Representative.*

FARBAND,  
LABOR ZIONIST ORDER,  
*New York 3, N. Y., June 17, 1953.*

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: I am glad to inform you that the general executive committee of Farband—Labor Zionist Order has, at its last meeting unanimously endorsed the proposal recently made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower for the admission into the United States of 240,000 displaced persons as immigrants from Europe during the next 2 years.

The Farband—Labor Zionist Order is a fraternal benefit and educational organization with a membership of over 30,000 in 300 branches located in more than 110 communities throughout the United States and Canada.

The general executive committee, in endorsing this recommendation of President Eisenhower is sure that this action meets with the unanimous approval of the entire membership of this society.

Hoping that your committee will act favorably on this very important recommendation of the President, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS SEGAL, *General Secretary.*

PITTSBURGH DIOCESAN COUNCIL OF  
CATHOLIC WOMEN OF THE N. C. C. W.,  
*Pittsburgh, Pa., June 18, 1953.*

HON. LEWIS E. GRAHAM,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: On behalf of the Pittsburgh Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, a federation representing the Catholic women's organizations and societies of 6 counties of southwestern Pennsylvania, we wish to express our support of the Watkins bill, S. 1917, authorizing the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

The Pittsburgh Diocesan Council feels that the passage of such legislation will help alleviate the problems created by the overpopulation and Communist tyranny in Western Europe. We, therefore, wholeheartedly support this measure.

Sincerely yours,

PITTSBURGH DIOCESAN COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN,  
TERESA K. WUNDERLICH, *President.*

## EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

FEDERATION OF RUSSIAN CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE  
UNITED STATES,

*San Francisco, Calif., June 8, 1953.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MR. CHAIRMAN AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS: This is to confirm the memorandum on S. 1917 submitted by our president, Leon L. Nicoli, to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

As stated, this federation is primarily interested in the inclusion in proposed emergency legislation on immigration of provisions which would take care of the fate of the groups of Russian anti-Communist refugees in China and Trieste.

We earnestly consider that one of the best ways of fighting communism is by rendering assistance to its victims, who, we are sure, if given encouragement, will become our stanchest allies in our struggle for a free, democratic world.

S. 1917 is an effort to solve an emergency problem sponsored by our President and some of our leading Senators and, as such, merits full support.

Very truly yours,

SERGE BELOSSELSKY,

*Vice President and Representative in Eastern United States.*

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a. m., the committee recessed until 10 a. m. Wednesday, June 10, 1953.)

# EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1 OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, in room 327, Old House Office Building, Hon. Louis E. Graham, chairman, presiding.

Present: Messrs. Graham, Walter, Celler, Hillings, and Miss Thompson.

Also present: Mr. Walter M. Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee will please come to order.

I have here for incorporation in the record some communications, both pro and con, on this issue.

(The communications are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL A. FINO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE  
STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank the Chairman and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to appear before this committee and testify in favor of the measure relating to emergency immigration.

I am happy to speak on this much needed legislation not only as a Member of this Congress, but as the Representative of 363,000 people of the 25th Congressional District of New York.

Not long ago President Eisenhower asked Congress to enact legislation to permit the entry of 240,000 European immigrants to this country during the next 2 years. He urged this measure in the national interest. And because I thoroughly agree with him that this measure is very much in the national interest I appear today to urge upon this committee the importance of immediate action in approval of legislation necessary to carry out the President's program.

Why is this proposal in the national interest? First of all, every thinking American knows that the refugee situation is one of the most serious threats to any kind of security in our world. We have only to recall the exile origins of our own Nation to recognize that it is also an opportunity. But we know, too, that the ready solution of our ancestors is no longer available to the modern-day refugee. The open door to victims of political, religious, and economic persecution has been gradually but firmly closed. And that is one reason President Eisenhower has asked that we reopen our doors to 240,000 persons for a brief period of 2 years.

In the second place, this proposal is in the national interest because the increase in the refugee problem is growing more acute as Communist oppression increases. It is further compounded by the tragic condition of overpopulation among our allies. Unemployment, which is the offspring of overpopulation, breeds economic instability, political and social unrest, and spiritual collapse.

The solution suggested by the President is a reasonable one. Even a small amount of emigration can have a lasting and successful effect in relieving the difficulties arising from surplus population. It will provide the immediate relief which is necessary to the long-range program of economic development.

The most seriously disturbed countries are Italy, Western Germany, Austria, Greece, and the Netherlands. What these countries need is a chance to reestablish the balance between their populations and their resources. Our programs of foreign aid are designed to help them boost their economies to a more stable

level. Simultaneously we must help them deal with the other side of the equation, their population.

Our help will have the very practical effect of providing more job opportunities in Europe. In addition, it will have the more intangible effect of creating renewed hope and vigor for thousands of European workers and their families.

In one sense, these are the people on whose shoulders the fate of the free world ultimately rests. They are ordinary human beings. They have simple wants—enough to eat, a chance to work and live with self-respect, a decent home, an opportunity to have a normal family life, and the right to hope. By welcoming to our shores a few European refugees—we will have kept the lift of hope burning for the many disinherited and dispossessed remaining in Europe.

What is at stake here is not simply our humanitarian tradition of providing an asylum for the oppressed. It is the whole complex issue of what we as leaders in the free world can do to promote world peace.

The action which President Eisenhower has recommended would be a step toward stabilizing European economies and governments. We can hope that by taking this step ourselves, other nations will be inspired to join in a cooperative effort to promote world peace and freedom. We can be very certain that if we do our part to overcome the difficulties inherent in the refugee situation, we shall have taken another important step toward the hope of peace in our time.

For these reasons among others, I urge this committee to give favorable consideration to this proposed emergency legislation.

STATEMENT ON INCLUSION OF AN ORPHAN SECTION IN EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION  
LEGISLATION SUBMITTED BY CATHOLIC COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES, NEW  
YORK, N. Y.

The Catholic Committee for Refugees located at 265 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y., is an organization operating under a charter of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C. The executive director is the Right Reverend Monsignor Emil N. Komora. The committee has been in existence for 16 years and its original function was to assist refugees from nazism. Subsequently it functioned in behalf of displaced persons under the President's directive. On the passage of the DP Act of 1948 it undertook work in behalf of displaced priests, displaced teachers, and displaced war orphans.

Although we are fully in sympathy with passage of emergency immigration legislation and although it is our earnest hope that some such measure will be passed during this session of Congress, nevertheless our purpose in coming here today is solely to appeal to this committee to include some provision for orphans in whatever bill is ultimately reported out.

Communications by the hundreds have reached our office asking for European orphans and from information which has reached us there are many such orphans facing hopeless futures who are available for emigration to the United States. The following figures in round numbers are those given us by War Relief Services-NCWC offices at Frankfurt, Salzburg, and Rome. We believe they are reliable and indicate the number of orphans in need of aid and available. Again they are orphans who would be serviced by our committee. We have no figures as to the number which would be serviced by other organizations. When we use the term orphan, we use it as defined in sections 2 (e) and 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended. The classifications below are on the basis of location, parentage, and age.

A. German Federal Republic:		
DP under age 10.....	600	
German under age 10.....	345	
		945
B. Austria: DP and Austrian under age 10.....		500
C. Italy:		
Italian under age 10.....	500	
Italian over age 10.....	500	
		1, 000
		2, 445
Total orphans under age 10.....		1, 945
Total orphans over age 10.....		500
Grand total.....		2, 445

Of the several emergency immigration bills which we have seen it would appear that only H. R. 4842 (Carrigg) has provision for orphans and this in sections 2 (d) and 4 (h). We might add that in our humble opinion the two sections seem quite adequate for the purpose in mind. To be specific with reference to the aforementioned bill:

*Section 2 (d)*

(1) *Residence.*—This is rather more than adequate for our purpose, since the orphans of which we have knowledge reside in Germany, Austria and Italy. However, other groups might wish the inclusion of other areas, e. g., Greece. It is obvious when one bears in mind the vast upheavals and tragedies of today's Europe that orphans do not constitute an exclusive problem of any one group.

(2) *Definition.*—This is similar to that of section 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 as amended and is of sufficient flexibility for a program of this nature.

(3) *Assurance satisfactory to the Administrator on adoption or guardianship proceedings.*—Together with carefully drawn regulations we believe this language would provide the necessary social safeguards.

(4) *Assurance on proper care.*—It seems to us that this section together with adequate regulations would cover section 212 (a) (15) of Public Law 414.

(5) *Under age 18.*—This affords the possibility of keeping together sibling groups where 1 or the other child may be over age 10 and it would also assist those who would come to relatives and are over 10.

*Section 4 (h)*

*Allocation of 3,500 visas for orphans.*—Judging from past performance under the DP Act it would appear that a figure in this amount for use over a 3-year period is realistic. Moreover, we believe it important that a special allocation be made for orphans in order to avoid competition for numbers between adults and orphans. In view of the complexity of processing orphans for emigration it is quite conceivable that without such a provision inadequate numbers or none will be available for orphans in the last few months of operation.

Incidentally, the words "including adopted children" found in various bills have no applicability here since the children we have in mind have not as yet been adopted but would come here for adoption or guardianship. Again orphans falling under the Austrian or Italian quotas would face hopeless delay under our basic immigration law because of oversubscription, and reliance on future under-subscription of the German quota would be too hazardous a proposition on which to embark upon a program of bringing such orphans to American homes within a reasonable time.

We are keenly interested in this problem and we believe the facilities for doing a socially sound job are available. Procedures are surrounded with the necessary safeguards designed for the best interests of the child and his prospective American parents and hence the national interest. Detailed case histories and documentation are made available to recognized social agencies in the several States authorized to place children for adoption, and supervision and responsibility is assumed by these local agencies. We are well aware of the reasons for the defeat of the Armstrong amendment during the debate on Public Law 414 but we humbly submit that the social techniques and skills gained by experience under section 2 (e) and section 2 (f) of the DP Act of 1948 have brought forth the means to overcome these difficulties. Granted a good statute and adequate regulations and administration we feel a delicate problem of this nature can be handled properly and with substantial benefit of this country.

May we, therefore, earnestly commend for your sympathetic consideration the inclusion of an orphan provision in whatever bill you see fit to report out. Our experience with over 1,700 of these orphans, and our observation of their adjustment and assimilation in American homes has convinced us beyond the shadow of a doubt that such a program is sound. In our humble opinion, previous congressional action in this respect has made possible for these orphans a future such as only this Nation can give; it has brought a little more joy to some of our American homes; and it has added a little more strength dedicated to the defense and protection of this blessed land. Over 60 of these youngsters are now members of our Armed Forces, and one of them, who arrived here as an alien bearing an agency identification tag, has now returned from Korea, a United States citizen, wearing among other distinctions, the Purple Heart. Finally, when writing a bill, let it not be forgotten for whom it is done, when one remembers the least of our brethren.

MAY 22, 1953.

Congressman LOUIS GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee House Judiciary,*  
*Room 346, Old House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: Will you please include the following statement from the Daughters of the American Revolution in the hearings before your Subcommittee of the House Judiciary which is considering the President's message concerning refugees:

Every day letters are received in volume not only from our members, but other Americans. These are the questions in the correspondence to the National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, when they discuss this plan to allow 240,000 or more refugees to come into these United States under "special visa":

Americans are paying burdensome taxes. Economists and many of our legislators who have the interests of American citizens foremost have warned that when taxes are above 25 percent of the average income initiative is discouraged, private enterprise is restricted and one cannot save to protect his future and that of his family. The average taxes are now about 33 percent of the average income. How can we afford to allow the entrance of these aliens, when within a couple of short years, when they become American citizens they will be eligible for social security, aid for the aged, and unemployment compensation? They have not previously paid into this fund—so we, the great average Americans, will again shoulder the burden and rather than having tax relief by a cut—will indubitably have our taxes raised. Think it over. Think of the American people back home whom you wish to represent to the best of your ability.

One of the resolutions adopted on immigration by the 4,000 delegates of the 62d Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, from every State in the Union, says:

"Whereas, at the present time there are in the United States from 3 million to 5 million illegal aliens; and

"Whereas, entries of illegal aliens into the United States and violations of the immigration laws of this country are increasing at an alarming rate; and

"Whereas, the statistics of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reveal that an analysis of approximately 5,000 'of the more militant members of the Communist Party' show that 91.5 percent of them were either of foreign birth, or born of foreign parents, and that over half of them traced their origins either to Russia or to her satellite countries; \* \* \*

And there is where Senate 1917 on page 2 jeopardizes our Republic. Remembering the FBI warning, listen to S. 1917:

"German expellee means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, western sector of Berlin, or in Austria, who was born in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Republics, Yugoslavia \* \* \*" et cetera. Gentlemen, these so-called refugees could be the agents of all the Communist-dominated countries from which they are emigrating. Less than a thousand Communists gained control of the Soviet Socialist Union and its 190 million people. [Emphasis ours.]

Now, let us consider page 3 " \* \* \* issuance of visas to aliens seeking to enter the United States as immigrants and to their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and stepchildren \* \* \*" Gentlemen, the United States is fast approaching its own overpopulation period—why hurry the problem and cause chaos among our laboring groups? Unemployment is just being felt in this country. Is it fair to American labor to allow these aliens into our country?

But, most of all, gentlemen, is it fair to the American boys who are being drafted for the United Nations Korean "police action"? France won't draft her young men to fight in French Indochina, but is suggesting that the NATO troops (mostly Americans) be sent there to protect French territory. Fifty-three nations of the United Nations endorsed the Korean action but only 17 of these nations have sent token forces—yet, some of these very nations claim a surplus population and want the United States to accept the surplus which they are not drafting (as we are drafting Americans), for either the United Nations war or for the NATO Army. There are about a million and a quarter American veterans now as a result of this United Nations action. Is it fair to allow these refugees to come into the United States and take the jobs which our boys were forced to leave by the draft? We are caught either way—either our boys won't get the jobs they had—or we



will have to foot the bill for unemployment compensation for the new citizens who pour into this country under the refugee bills.

Let's give Americans a little thought, gentlemen. Let's not follow the prophesy of Joseph Stalin: I shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction. Soon we will have not only destroyed ourselves financially, but in American manpower, while other nations protect their nationals by sending them to this country for safety. Think it over seriously for the Daughters of the American Revolution and the American people have absolute confidence that our duly elected legislators will on their sacred honor and with courageous action consider the people of the United States first in any decision which results from these hearings.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Most respectfully yours,

FRANCES B. LUCAS  
Mrs. James C. Lucas,  
*Executive Secretary, National Defense Committee, NSDAR.*

THE TOLEDO CATHOLIC CHARITIES,  
*Toledo, Ohio, May 15, 1953.*

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
*Representative from Pennsylvania,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: I should like to recommend to you the most favorable consideration of the proposal to enact emergency legislation authorizing the entry into this country of some 200,000 to 300,000 people from critical areas during the next couple of years. I understand that a bill will be introduced in the present legislature embodying a recommendation of the President of the United States to this end.

I believe that we have a moral obligation as a free and prosperous nation to do everything in our power to make possible the immigration of those harrassed and suffering people who, through no fault of their own, are bereft of a homeland. I most sincerely urge your favorable consideration and action when this bill comes before you for consideration.

Thanking you for your courtesy,

Very sincerely yours,

Very Rev. M. J. DOYLE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 20, 1953.*

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM: Urgently request that you take all necessary steps to assure emergency legislation, in line with the President's message of April 22, calling for special legislation to admit 240,000 nonquota immigrants within the next 2 years. Our organization is especially interested in aiding escapees and refugees entrapped in various parts of the world. We strongly feel that problems of overpopulation should not be included in this special legislation since 240,000 hardly adequately cover most urgent groups of homeless refugees, escapees, victims of communism.

LEON DOUNRADZE,  
*Chairman, Caucasian Relief Society,  
200 East 16th Street, New York City.*

DIOCESAN RESETTLEMENT COUNCIL  
FOR DISPLACED PERSONS,  
*Pittsburgh, Pa., May 19, 1953.*

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
*United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As diocesan resettlement director for displaced persons in the Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh, I am appealing to you to use your good offices in the passage of emergency legislation to permit the entry into this country of refugees from critical areas during the next couple years. This is in the interest of pure humanity and in agreement with the wish of the President of our country.

These people will make good citizens and will aid not only the material but also

the spiritual welfare of our country. If we are a Christian country, and we are, this could be one of the finest acts of Christianity that we could demonstrate to the world.

Would you be so kind to favor this legislation and bring to bear your great influence and conviction in ordering this legislation.

Respectfully yours,

(Rev.) THOMAS B. LAPPAN,  
*Diocesan Resettlement Director.*

---

ST. LOUIS RESETTLEMENT COMMITTEE  
FOR DISPLACED PERSONS, AFFILIATED WITH  
NATIONAL CATHOLIC RESETTLEMENT COUNCIL,  
*St. Louis, Mo., May 19, 1953.*

Hon. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
*United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In a recent message to Congress, President Eisenhower urged the passage of emergency legislation, which would provide for entry into the United States of some 200,000 people from critical areas of Europe during the next 2 years.

I am writing to ask that you use your influence to secure the passage of some type of emergency law, which will provide for the relief of people whose plight can be solved by immigration to the United States. It is understood, of course, that any such legislation will also be so framed as to protect the interests of our own country.

Our resettlement committee has been instrumental in helping some 1,800 displaced persons and expellees begin life anew in the eastern half of the State of Missouri. It is in the light of our successful experience with these people that we ask for the passage of new emergency legislation.

With the assurance of our genuine appreciation for any assistance you might give the cause for which we plead, I am

Sincerely yours,

REV. VICTOR SUREN,  
*Diocesan Resettlement Director.*

---

THE COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION  
OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,  
*New York, N. Y., May 20, 1953.*

Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. REED: Herewith I have the pleasure to transmit a statement of the Council for Social Action on the subject of legislation for the admission of refugees.

If there is anything further we can do at this time please let us know. We stand ready to help with the proposed program with our resources of finances and personnel.

Respectfully yours,

RAY GIBBONS.

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL  
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

*To the House Judiciary Committee Regarding the President's Proposal for Admission of Refugees:*

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches appreciates the opportunity of filing a statement in support of the President's proposal to admit 240,000 refugees in the next 2 years.

The Council for Social Action is composed of a board of 18 persons elected by the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches, which is the representative body of over 6,000 churches and 1,100,000 members. The Council for Social Action has been given the responsibility by the general council of helping the individual churches make the Christian Gospel more effective in society in the areas of international relations, race relations, and economic affairs. According

to our polity, each individual church and each national board speaks only for itself.

The experience of the Congregational Christian Churches in the resettlement of over 4,000 displaced persons in the period of 1948-52 indicates there is a genuine concern among church people for the welfare of the homeless people of the world and a willingness to go to great effort and cost to give them a new start in this country.

In 1 of our churches a few people agreed to take care of 1 refugee family, but the interest grew so rapidly that the men of the church redecored a small roominghouse accommodating 30 persons, the women provided counseling and furnished apartments, and the young people raised money and guided the newcomers. The last report was that this church had resettled over 250 displaced persons and was following each family with a view to furthering their integration into American life and becoming citizens of the United States. This kind of satisfactory experience has been repeated in church after church which has felt that in this way it was helping people attain new dignity and usefulness in the free world.

Recently the Council for Social Action distributed a packet of materials for study of our immigration policy, drawing special attention to the need for a new act of Congress permitting entrance of refugees over and above the regular quotas. More than 200 church groups have requested this material and have given the matter their careful attention. Many of those replying have had personal experience in the recent resettlement of refugees from Western Europe.

At its meetings in January 1953 the Council for Social Action considered the plight of the refugees and passed the following statement, which we earnestly commend to your attention:

"In our contemporary world between 30 and 60 million people are refugees—individuals and families uprooted from their homes and trying to find a place to reestablish themselves; 20,000 of these refugees are in Greece; 380,000 are in Turkey; 850,000 are Arab refugees in the Middle East; 500,000 are Chinese in Hong Kong who have fled from the mainland; 8 million are Hindus from Pakistan; 5 million are Moslems from India. Between 500 and 1,000 people are coming into West Berlin every day from countries behind the Iron Curtain.

"The situation is not merely a postwar or an emergency problem. It is a factor of our age—an outgrowth of war and the clash of ideologies and national interests. UNRRA, the IRO, and displaced-persons legislation were emergency measures which have come to an end. In the United Nations, the office of High Commissioner for Refugees has been established. But this office is badly crippled by lack of funds. No competent, worldwide refugee authority is now in existence.

"As has been said, the problem of the refugees can be settled in three ways: through assimilation, emigration, or starvation. Some of them will starve, most of them must be assimilated in those countries or areas where they now are. Present legislation does not permit the entrance to the United States of any considerable number of refugees. The Council for Social Action believes that the United States should help a fair share of them to reestablish themselves in this country.

"The Council for Social Action joins with the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America in urging the present session of Congress to enact emergency legislation, providing for the admission of approximately 250,000 refugees during the next 3-year period. Such refugees should be admitted without discrimination as to race, color, nationality, or religion."

---

ALBANY DIOCESAN RESETTLEMENT BUREAU FOR DISPLACED PERSONS,  
Albany, N. Y., May 20, 1953.

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRAHAM: President Eisenhower, in a recent statement, urged the Congress to consider special emergency immigration legislation that would admit 200,000 European refugees to this country during the next 2 years.

As a religious social agency serving the people of 13 counties of New York State, we are hopeful of the passage of some bill that would continue this resettlement program.

Therefore, we would be interested in knowing whether you favor such legislation and would be willing to support a bill of that kind.

Thanking you for your personal comment on this matter, I am

Cordially yours,

Rev. JOHN W. KEEFE, Director.

ASSOCIATION OF FREE ROMANIANS IN THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, SECRETARIAT,  
New York, N. Y., May 21, 1953.

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
*Chairman, Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Association of Free Romanians in the United States of America, a nonprofit organization of anti-Communist Romanian exiles who have found abode in the United States, permit us to express to you our hope that the subcommittee which you are heading will give favorable consideration to the legislative proposals aiming at the admission of 240,000 refugees and escapees from Europe.

In writing to you in this matter, we are prompted by our concern for all refugees and escapees, but most particularly for those from our own country, Rumania. For we are only too aware that by approving the proposed emergency legislation, the United States Congress would relieve many hundreds of worthy Rumanian refugees and their families in Germany, Italy, and France from the terrible plight caused to them by the inability of the host countries to provide them employment. We are certain that if admitted to the United States, these staunch anti-Communists would make themselves useful to this great country.

In the event that the program suggested by President Eisenhower would not receive congressional approval, we respectfully beg you to consider at least an amendment to the present immigration law increasing the very small Eastern European quotas. Let us point out that the Rumanian immigration quota of 289 people is particularly small and half of it is mortgaged on account of admissions under the Displaced Persons Act. An increase of this quota by legislative action would be, in our view, not only a humanitarian gesture, but also a most effective political move, for it would indicate to the enslaved Rumanian people that the United States Congress is truly concerned for their fellow countrymen having made a successful flight for freedom.

Very truly yours,

VINTILA V. BRATIANU,  
*Acting Chairman, Executive Board.*  
Dr. MIRON BUTARIU,  
*Secretary.*

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
SETTLEMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS,  
New York, N. Y., May 27, 1953.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*Subcommittee on Immigration, House Judiciary Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in favor of a legislation which is currently before you to grant 240,000 visas for admission of refugees and escapees. The refugee problem is one of the most serious problems in the world today and considering our position of world leadership, we must indeed open our doors to these unfortunate victims of the political mess in which the world finds itself.

We would call particular attention to the repatriates and returnees in Greece and Italy and ask that they be included in the legislation. We would urge you further to make this legislation as broad as possible and thereby avoid creating further world tension such as was created by many sections of the McCarran-Walter law. I would appreciate it if you would insert this letter in the record to the hearing currently before the committee.

Sincerely,

FERN M. COLBORN,  
*Secretary, Social Education and Action.*

THE AMERICAN DEFENSE SOCIETY, INC.,  
New York, N. Y., May 21, 1953.

Chairman GRAHAM,  
*Immigration Committee.*

DEAR SIR: The American Defense Society wishes to enter their protest against any bill to allow immigrants over the quota as shown in McCarran-Walter Act to be admitted to the United States. We appeared before the Truman committee of investigation and are on record in their report.

There are so many reasons why all immigration should be suspended at this time that it is an insult for any American to even think of adding to the number allowed by law. Mr. Eisenhower said in his campaign speeches that amendments might be made to the present law but it is evident that someone (maybe Senator Ives who wants to be Governor of New York) sold him the idea he could swing some racial votes by making a gesture which has disgusted those of us who know the influence behind this bill.

J. RICE GIBBS,  
*Chairman, Immigration American Defense Society.*

—  
DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,  
*New York 25, N. Y., May 29, 1953.*

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. REED: The annual convention of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, consisting of the clergy and the lay delegates from 227 parishes and missions, at its session held in the Synod House, New York, on Tuesday, May 12, 1953, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the flight of hundreds of thousands of freedom-loving people from Communist oppression has created situations involving untold human suffering in many parts of the world, as in West Germany: Be it therefore,

"Resolved, That the convention favors immediate legislation providing for the admission of an equitable proportion of these refugees to the United States."

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE B. LARSEN,  
*Secretary of Convention.*

—  
DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,  
*New York 25, N. Y., May 29, 1953.*

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: The annual convention of the Episcopal Diocese of New York, consisting of the clergy and the lay delegates from 227 parishes and missions, at its session held in the Synod House, New York, on Tuesday, May 12, 1953, adopted the following resolutions:

"I

"Whereas the McCarran Immigration Act of 1952 perpetuates a quota system based upon the now outmoded census of 1920 and upon racial theories that are scientifically unsound and contrary to the clear implications of the Christian doctrine of man; and

"Whereas the moral position of the United States as a leader of the free peoples of the world is compromised by a policy inconsistent with our professed faith in the dignity and worth of man; and

"Whereas an amendment of the McCarran Act is supported by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and the American Board of Jewish Rabbis; was promised in the national platforms of both major political parties; and is favored by the President of the United States: Be it, therefore,

"Resolved, That the annual convention of the Diocese of New York favors a revision of the immigration law to remove discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin.

"II

"Whereas the flight of hundreds of thousands of freedom-loving people from Communist oppression has created situations involving untold human suffering in many parts of the world, as in West Germany: Be it, therefore,

"Resolved, That the convention favors immediate legislation providing for the admission of an equitable proportion of these refugees to the United States."

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE B. LARSEN,  
*Secretary of Convention.*

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF BROOKLYN,  
*Brooklyn, N. Y., June 1, 1953.*

Representative CHAUNCEY M. REED,  
*House of Representatives,  
 Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REED: The board of directors of the Brooklyn Young Women's Christian Association is in accord with President Eisenhower's recommendation that special legislation be enacted to permit 240,000 nonquota immigrants from Western Europe, and urge that all steps be taken to expedite passage of this emergency legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH M. DEMARIS,  
*Executive Director.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE MASS MEETING HELD AT THE METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE, BROAD AND POPLAR STREETS, PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON SATURDAY, MAY 23, 1953

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, assembled at a mass meeting at the Metropolitan Opera House, Broad and Poplar Streets, Saturday, May 23, 1953, commemorating the memory of approximately 7 million Ukrainians ruthlessly murdered by the Kremlin in 1932 and 1933, appeal to all our fellow Americans to remain constantly vigilant and aware of the most terrible threat humanity has ever known; to guard against succumbing to false Russian peace overtures delivered with the aim of weakening the defenses of the free world, hereby resolve:

1. To appeal to the freedom-loving people of America to support the Ukrainians and other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain in their resistance to the Communist regime and in their struggle to throw off the alien barbaric rule of Communist Russia;

2. To appeal to the United States Congress to establish a special commission to investigate the genocidal practices of the Kremlin perpetrated upon Ukrainians and other nationalities throughout their long and horrible enslavement in the Soviet Union;

3. To appeal to the United States Congress to pass the special Immigration Act proposed by Senator Watkins (S. 1917) whereby 240,000 victims of Soviet cruelty would be allowed to enter the United States;

4. To appeal to the United States Congress to expand the United States escapee program, as one of the best means to further the freedom-loving, humanitarian foreign policy of the United States;

5. To appeal to the United States Clemency Board in Bonn to review the heavy sentences imposed upon three Ukrainian youths, Lytwyn, Gnyp, and Cipera and show them leniency as befits a great freedom-loving nation;

6. To reaffirm that the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is the only body authorized to speak for and on behalf of Americans of Ukrainian descent;

7. To express full confidence in President Eisenhower's administration and assure him of our full support for his foreign and domestic policies.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,  
 PHILADELPHIA CHAPTER,  
*Philadelphia, Pa.*

MASSACHUSETTS CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE  
 AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY,  
*Boston, Mass., May 29, 1953.*

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,  
*The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: I am sending to you a copy of one of the resolutions passed last week at the 154th Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society. This resolution was mailed to ministers of our churches last Thursday along with the others passed at the meeting. We trust that many were used as a basis for sermons and reports on Sunday.

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, the intent of which is to permit an additional number of immigrants above the regular quotas of the countries of their origin to enter the United States; and

"Whereas a special quota is thereunder allotted to the Netherlands, who also have a refugee problem; be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Congregational Christian Conference endorse and approve the spirit which has prompted the entering of this act and the principles involved and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Congressmen representing the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

Cordially,

MYRON W. FOWELL.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,  
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1953.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE GRAHAM: We understand that hearings are now being held before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee of which you are chairman, on bills proposing to admit from 328,000 to 400,000 special visa or nonquota immigrants.

Will you please incorporate into the hearing record copies of resolutions adopted by the National Society of New England Women and the National Society Women Descendants of the Ancient & Honorable Artillery Company bearing on this subject together with this letter of comment?

These societies deem it common sense to protect the American economy, independent of foreign ideologies, insure employment, adequate housing, and educational opportunities for Americans first, as a logical measure for the survival of this Republic. They are concerned because of the numbers of aliens already in this country illegally and those of foreign stock and noncitizens who are either unfriendly witnesses, loyalty suspects, atomic spies, or potential saboteurs. They don't think it makes sense to open the floodgates in these critical times and do not believe it can be argued successfully that it is in the "interests" of this country to do so.

It seems to us that the Congress has the legislative power, a power the President does not have but has usurped for 20 years. With the "change" voted we expected to see this evil corrected; instead we see it perpetuated. The arguments advanced for this type of legislation were also advanced by the last administration executive in directing the legislative branch what it must do.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act after 4 years of study, deserves a chance to become operative and to be upheld in the interests of the people of the United States of America who are entitled to a minimum of protection.

We urge that these various bills be not reported favorably.

Sincerely,

MADALIN D. LEETCH.  
Mrs. W. D. LEETCH.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL SOCIETY WOMEN DESCENDANTS OF THE ANCIENT & HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY IN ANNUAL MEETING, STATLER HOTEL, APRIL 14, 1953, WASHINGTON, D. C.

#### SUPPORT OF THE M'CARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Resolved, That the National Society Women Descendants of the Ancient & Honorable Artillery Company in 26th Annual Rendezvous support the McCarran-Walter immigration law against repeal or crippling amendments urged by pressure groups for ulterior purposes.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN IN 40TH ANNUAL CONGRESS, PORTSMOUTH, N. H., MAY 19, 20, 21, 1953

#### SUPPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Whereas bills have been introduced in the House and Senate for the admission of from 328,000 to 400,000 special visa or nonquota immigrants or refugees; and Whereas 4 years' study produced the present law which was passed over the President's veto and became effective December 24, 1952;

*Resolved*, That the 40th Congress of the National Society of New England Women support this Immigration and Nationality Act together with its national origins principle and quota system and careful screening process and oppose crippling amendments or the admittance of aliens outside of the provisions of this act.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,  
Nashville, Tenn., June 8, 1953.

HON. LOUIS GRAHAM,  
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Immigration,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: I am writing relative to the matter of 240,000 visas to uprooted persons from other countries.

I have before me the testimony of Mr. Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director of the department of international justice and goodwill of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, relative to this problem.

I understand that committee hearings will be held on June 8. I understand, further, that you are concerned with this problem.

I want to support the statement which Mr. Van Kirk has made and to say that I trust you will give this matter your serious consideration.

My impression of the situation in Europe when I visited there 4 years ago was that some of the small countries of Europe—namely, Holland and Sweden—are doing a great deal more in proportion to their resources for the unfortunate people of Europe than is this country. I realize, of course, that we are farther removed from the situation and that persons in this country are not as keenly aware of the problem as are those living only across the border from a group of refugees. It does seem to me, however, that this country has a responsibility to these persons larger than we have assumed to date. I think it is notable the work that has been done in bringing displaced persons into this country. It would appear to me, however, that the legislation which President Eisenhower called for on April 22, namely, that 240,000 visas be issued to these groups, is reasonable.

I trust that legislation may be enacted which will permit these persons to enter this country and which will provide for a reasonable distribution of the visas to the various pressure areas.

Yours very truly,

DORIS DENNISON.

Mr. GRAHAM. The first witness is Judge Juvenal Marchisio. Will you proceed, please?

**STATEMENT OF HON. JUVENAL MARCHISIO, NEW YORK, N. Y.,  
ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON ITALIAN  
MIGRATION**

Mr. MARCHISIO. My first impulse is to express my appreciation to you and the committee for this opportunity to be heard. I have submitted copies to the committee of a detailed memorandum which sets forth the argument of the American Committee on Italian Migration which I am privileged to represent here this morning.

This memorandum is submitted by the American Committee on Italian Migration, a national organization representing the thinking of more than 5 million Americans of Italian origin, in support of President Eisenhower's message to Congress requesting emergency legislation authorizing the issuance of 248,000 special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

Certain major facts should be considered when discussing the advisability of the passage forthwith of legislation to permit the entry into the United States, within its national needs and, of course, with due protection to its national security, of immigrants from the countries



named which are associated with us in defense of the fundamental freedoms that are our heritage.

No attempt is made here to pass judgment on present policies in their historical origin or to compare critically the law presently regulating the number and type of immigrants admitted.

Senator Pat McCarran himself said on January 31, 1952—

Mr. President, one of the most serious problems which is facing the free world today is the problem of the surplus population of the free countries of Western Europe. It is a problem which is becoming increasingly more acute because of the additions to the western European population caused every month by thousands upon thousands of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. Although it is principally a humanitarian problem it is likewise an economic and political problem which has a direct bearing on our efforts to strengthen the free world against Communist encroachment.

The solution to these problems cannot and should not be the responsibility of any one nation. It is an international responsibility—an integral part of the world crisis which the free nations must face together. It demands the cooperative efforts of all interested countries. But a real solution can be found only if the United States, the recognized leader of the free world, does its part and thus helps the economies of those nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that they may fulfill their obligations in the defense of Western Europe.

The bulk of emigration needs will have to be taken care of by nations other than the United States, but our country can and must assist in the resettlement of these people. Unless the United States does something at home it cannot speak forcefully on the subject abroad.

Now, for some facts: Today our growing economy can make effective use of additional manpower available in the following countries, allied with us, which are suffering from a manpower clot that unless relieved will result in a Communist stroke.

Despite the fact that Italy's birthrate is lower than that of the United States, she now has 5 million more people than her present economy can hope to sustain—more than 2 million of which are totally unemployed and the balance underemployed. Included in this number are more than 600,000 returnees and refugees from her former colonies in Africa, Venezia Giulia, Dalmatia, Dodecanese Islands, and from abroad. In addition Italy lost approximately 900,000 hectares of territory in Venezia Giulia and Dalmatia and approximately 350 million hectares in the colonies.

Italy's population of over 47 million—the United Nations estimate made in 1949 then fixed it at 46,001,000—is contained in a territory smaller than that of California—two-thirds of which is virtually unproductive, having no coal, iron, copper, oil or cotton—necessities of modern living.

In Germany, since 1945 it has had to absorb in the western zone 7,800,000 persons of German ethnic origin who were expelled from Eastern European countries. In addition there is the dramatic story of hundreds of thousands of refugees escaping from the eastern zone of Germany and from those countries behind the Iron Curtain.

It is significant that the German Federal Republic reports that it will be able to maintain and employ all but 1 million of these people, predominantly farming families, that cannot be placed in its industries.

As a consequence of the guerrilla warfare in Greece, almost 700,000

people were forced to abandon the agricultural areas and to take refuge in towns.

Only 550,000 of these displaced persons have been resettled and absorbed leaving 140,000 homeless and jobless as the economy cannot provide employment for them. This represents one-fifth of the total of wage earners in the country. In addition there are 34,000 ethnic Greeks who were forced to flee Communist-dominated countries.

The Netherlands, because of the loss of its colonies, also has a grave surplus population problem.

Since transfer of sovereignty to Indonesia, some 12,500 inhabitants of the island of Amboina have come back to the Netherlands and an additional flow of Indo-Europeans is expected.

Eighty thousand Dutch nationals were evacuated during the recent floods which, taken in conjunction with the increase of the working population averaging 50,000 per annum, it is impossible for the country to reabsorb. This means that 25,000 workers—65,000 persons including families—must, in fact emigrate every year.

Why we must help: It is conservatively estimated that in the overpopulated countries of Western Europe there are at least 5 million people who, in terms of economic opportunity and resource, are considered excess. Immediate action on this problem is essential otherwise all the vast expenditures for armaments, Marshall plan, Mutual Security Administration, North Atlantic Treaty Organization and all other relative matters, unfortunately, may eventually be lost because financial and material aids alone are but shots of morphine which lessen the patient's suffering but do not cure the malady.

Never was there a greater opportunity than now—at no cost to us and with much profit to our economy and culture—to obtain increased faith abroad in the political and democratic strength of our way of life at a strategic point in the combat between democracy and communism.

If these people are left without hope of escape the oppressive conditions cannot be borne for long without erupting into violence of incalculable proportion. American security, to a considerable extent, depends upon Western Europe. No better evidence exists than the constant effort of the Soviet to win this vast machine shop with its trained manpower.

President Eisenhower on October 17, 1952 summarized this viewpoint succinctly when he said:

A contest for world leadership—in fact, for survival—exists between the Communist idea and the American ideal. That contest is being waged in the minds and hearts of human beings. We say—and we sincerely believe—that we are on the side of freedom; that we are on the side of humanity. We say—and we know—that the Communists are on the side of slavery, the side of inhumanity.

Yet to the Czech, the Pole, the Hungarian who takes his life in his hands and crosses the frontier tonight—or to the Italian who goes to some American consulate—this ideal that beckoned him can be a mirage \* \* \*.

What about European emigration in relation to America's needs? Current notions concerning immigration are the product of misinformation, prejudices, myths, and rationalizations and you hear much talk that the introduction of foreign born into this country would lower our American standard of living. The facts are otherwise.

It is to be noted that our periods of greatest expansion coincided with our periods of greatest immigration. It is also not to be disregarded that those States with the largest population percentages of

immigrant settlement are also States of greatest prosperity. To illustrate this point factually the following are examples from 1940 statistics:

State	Percentage of foreign born	Per capita income	State	Percentage of foreign born	Per capita income
New York.....	21.2	\$863	Mississippi.....	0.3	\$201
Massachusetts.....	19.7	766	Georgia.....	0.4	315
Rhode Island.....	19.3	715	Tennessee.....	0.4	317
Michigan.....	13.0	509			

These figures, as all economists agree, are no mere coincidence.

The best evidence available shows that the United States will continue to need more manpower both in agriculture and industry. Our expanding economy needs an expanding labor force; the needs of our industry especially have proved to be and will likely continue to be enormous.

Recently, New York State Industrial Commissioner, Edward Corsi, testified that—

We are suffering from a very great labor shortage in this State both on the farm and in the factory.

He stated that there are 350,366 unfilled farm jobs in New York State alone.

In our agriculture particularly we have need for additional people. Farm operators and farm workers are essential in our defense effort. Since 1949 there has again been an alarmingly sharp downward trend in the farm population of the United States. With the resumption of the movement from the farms to the cities, there is a real danger that in the years just ahead our agricultural production may be seriously hampered.

Our goals and sights for the future must encourage progressively higher levels of agricultural output. There are within this picture both the need and absorptive capacity of American agriculture for some augmentation of the supply of labor which a carefully liberalized policy of immigration would make available.

A rich pool of surplus farmers and farmworkers exists in the overpopulated areas discussed. Among the expellees in Western Germany there are many agricultural families with no opportunity for employment on the land; Italy has a 45-percent agricultural population and in the Netherlands there are large groups of agricultural workers who cannot find productive employment on the limited arable land available.

In considering the steps to be taken, we should measure the needs of the distressed people in Europe against our capacity to make good use of additional manpower and the extent of our international responsibilities. The problem we face is in the nature of an emergency. The national labor leaders of our country have unequivocally testified and are on the record as favoring the legislation requested. They are alarmed at shortages which exist in American industry. To name but a few: the garment industry where the lack of skilled needle is critical; the marble and granite industries where cutters are unavailable in the numbers required; the tile industry where skilled

craftsmen are desperately needed; the restaurant industry where skilled help, particularly waiters and chefs, is virtually unobtainable. These are the particular industries in which the Italian immigrant excels, and to which can be added an almost innumerable list including: architectural designers, mural painters and decorators, wood carvers, embossers, wrought-iron and stained-glass workers.

Why Italian immigrants? Over 90 percent of Americans of Italian origin reside in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, California, Michigan, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and it is significant that these States are outstanding in the progress they have made and have the highest annual per capita income.

Relief statistics demonstrate that the Italian immigrant rarely becomes a burden on the receiving country.

Italian immigrants rank high among the immigrant groups in the matter of naturalization. They come, establish themselves, and become American citizens as soon as possible.

Italian immigrants are frugal, sober, and industrious.

A conspicuous characteristic of Italians is their provident disposition, to own the homes they live in and to deposit the surplus of their earnings for the growing need of their families and to meet future exigencies.

In proportion to their numbers, a greater percentage of Americans of Italian origin served in World War II than any other nationality.

The Italian immigrants' record of loyalty to the United States is unexcelled by any other ethnic group.

The Italians' adaptation to and solicitude for the land is conspicuous in the development of California's agricultural potentialities, Colorado's sugar-beet industry, the Northeastern Potato and Midwestern Wheat Belts, in truck farming.

Despite popular belief to the contrary, the record shows that in proportion to numbers, fewer Americans of Italian origin are convicted of felony crime than any other minority group.

To summarize, this request in support of emergency legislation permitting approximately 240,000 people to enter the United States within the next 3 years over and above the present immigration quotas, is the smallest possible number that is consistent with American sincerity and desire to help the gravest problem facing Europe today.

Considered *against* the background of our own economy, this proposal will impose no hardship on anyone in the United States, not only because it provides for an insignificant number in comparison to the total population of this country, but also because America needs farm and other workers of scarce skills who, with blood relatives who are citizens, would receive first preference; will enable America to share with other nations the solution of the problem which is basic to the peace and freedom of the world; will add and strengthen America's prestige in Western Europe, particularly among the peoples of Germany, Italy, Holland, and Greece; will provide an effective response to daily Soviet propaganda; will be at least a token example which will serve to promote international migration from overpopulated countries to the other areas of the world that are land-rich and manpower-poor.

It will be an act of justice to those who, subsequent to Potsdam, were ruthlessly expelled by the Soviet and fled Communist terror to strengthen the ranks of freemen.

It will be an important arm of our foreign policy and will support our American propaganda abroad.

It encourages the political stability and unity of friendly and allied countries and will strengthen their economies and military potential.

It implements the resolution adopted in Lisbon in 1952 at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Conference concerning the importance of emigration, particularly for Italy, but also for other countries.

It recognizes that it is no accident that the country with the most serious overpopulation problem, namely, Italy, has the largest Communist party in Western Europe.

It recognizes that the absorbability of new immigrants has been studied and that it is estimated that the United States can absorb at least 100,000 more immigrants per year above the present quotas.

It will help free us from the implication of superiority or inferiority of peoples such as is inherent in the national origins quota system, without sacrificing the right of the United States to grant preference and priority.

It accepts the tragic plight of uprooted people in the world as a continuing problem and the need for America's traditional policy of helpfulness in providing a haven for the oppressed.

It does not, in essence, change the national origin plan which has already been scrapped by the simple fact that two of the biggest quota countries, Great Britain and Northern Ireland with over 65,000 and the Irish Free State with over 17,000, are not using even a major portion of their quotas at the present time.

If I may be permitted 1 or 2 additional observations, I feel that the subject which we are discussing is of great importance because here in America we are in part the custodians of that valued treasure of good will to men that we must now transmute into the tangible and substantial form by giving the surplus populations of the earth a chance in life by setting an example without changing our basic immigration law to permit some of these people who are needed in our national economy and for our own national security to find haven in this country.

It is obvious that the basic cause of war still is that some nations are overcrowded and their people hungry while others are practically underpopulated and have a surplus of the necessities of life.

Two Presidents of the United States, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, both have asked Congress not only for humanitarian and charitable reasons but for national interest to give at least a token of our understanding of this problem which we, of course, cannot solve alone; but since we have assumed the leadership of the free world, that we may set the example to other countries that are land-rich and man-poor. It is very important to us.

The elections just finished in Italy are an indication of how important it is psychologically for us to convince people across the sea, those who are allied with us in the common war against communism that we have their interests at heart.

We have funneled billions of dollars into Europe through private relief, through UNRRA, the Marshall plan, MSA, and yet, sometimes, all this good can be destroyed by failing to give that moral impetus to their hopes and to their aspirations which will enable them also practically and economically to sustain their burden in their alliance with us in NATO.

I could go on, I suppose, for a great length of time, but I will confine my remarks, in addition to those I have already made in my statement, specifically to Italian migration.

It is unnecessary to tell this honorable committee that Italy is a country of over 47 million people crushed in a territory smaller than the State of California in size, a country that has neither iron nor coal nor lead nor oil nor cotton, any of the necessities of modern living; that into this already overcrowded country more than 500,000 Italian nationals from the various colonies were dumped there.

The word, "Italian national," brings to my mind this thought: It has come to my attention just very recently that something has been said either here, or will be said here, to the effect that the Italian Government, in regard to possible legislation which would admit a token number of Italians to come here on an emergency basis without disturbing our basic law has indicated that it is immaterial whether these be returnees or whether they be Italian nationals.

Upon hearing that, I cleared early this morning with the Italian Ambassador who assured me the Italian Government, if this country in its hospitality and its goodness will give further assistance to the country it has already greatly helped, would like to send here Italian nationals, the best skilled labor that they possess, the finest quality people that they have, and wherever possible, those related to American citizens and that very definitely he authorized me, upon my request, to say so here today: The Italian Government, if its opinion were asked, would categorically say that it would like the descriptive phrase for such as may be permitted to enter to be labeled Italian nationals rather than——

Mr. WALTER. Of course, if what you say with respect to our basic law is correct, "nationals" would not be the proper term. It would be "natives," would it not?

Mr. MARCHISIO. The returnees to Italy are those who were, as I understand it, the occupants of Italian colonies and Italians who went there. They lived under the Italian flag until, at the close of the war, they were taken away from that.

Mr. WALTER. I understand all that. Excuse me; proceed.

Mr. MARCHISIO. I feel that in addition to what is contained in the memorandum and I know how pressed you gentlemen are for time, it is useless to repeat it.

May I say that America has grown great in its period of greatest expansion and that was due to the freshening tide of immigration for more than 300 years. It is a great source of strength to us. The people for whom I speak have been frugal, industrious, and sober. They have been hard-working from California to the East. It is important to note that over 90 percent of the people of Italian origin in this country are contained in 9 States and those 9 States have the highest per capita income and are the most prosperous in the United States.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask just one question? I believe you said that your organization represents the thinking of more than 5 million Americans of Italian origin.

Mr. MARCHISIO. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WALTER. That is either first generation or second generation or—

Mr. MARCHISIO. The 1940 census, while perhaps not too accurate, places the Italian migration as I recollect that figure at 5,600,000 at that time and rather than exaggerate, I minimize when I say 5 million. There are those who claim that our population in this country of Italian ancestry exceeds 10 million. I do not believe that is provable. It certainly exceeds 5,600,000, definitely.

Mr. WALTER. As of 1940.

Mr. MARCHISIO. 1940.

Mr. WALTER. Judge, if it is 5,600,000, how did they get here?

Mr. MARCHISIO. They came to this country through migration from Revolutionary days, very few in the beginning.

Mr. WALTER. Then you are not talking about first generation?

Mr. MARCHISIO. First and second generation, of course. I chance to be a native-born American citizen. I would include myself one of Italian origin. I say I believe they are Americans of Italian origin.

Mr. WALTER. Your organization has done considerable work in connection with the immigration laws and has made very serious studies of the laws, as I understand it.

Mr. MARCHISIO. We have tried to inform ourselves of the law, its implications both as to our economic prosperity at home, as to its effect upon our foreign policy. We feel that all must be integrated in one.

Mr. WALTER. I raise the question because yours is a responsible organization. I have in mind the pamphlet that was used to inflame the people that you are talking about. It makes charges about the Immigration and Nationality Code.

For example, it says that the law denies hearings as required under the Constitution. That, of course, is not true.

Secondly, it states that the code entraps the unwary into loss of American citizenship. It makes no attempt to restore American citizenship to those Americans who voted against communism in Italy. Just the opposite is the fact.

The next charge is that the code abolished in deportation cases the humane relief of adjusting status by going to Canada. Of course, we eliminated that by making it possible to adjust the status without leaving the States.

It says, destroys the human relief of suspension of deportation and will cause the separation of fathers, wives, and children. Of course, we liberalized existing law in that respect.

And so on.

Mr. MARCHISIO. I am quite sure, sir, that you will note that that pamphlet does not issue from our office nor that of the National Catholic Resettlement Council of which we are a part.

Mr. WALTER. No, sir. I raise the question only because ever since these hearings started I have sought the opportunity to throw some light on this subject. I am just a little bit tired of being the whipping boy of all the professionals. I do not care who the professionals are or what their color is. I am just a little bit tired of it.

Mr. MARCHISIO. It is my thinking, and I assume you are referring to the McCarran-Walter Act——

Mr. WALTER. I am referring to the Walter Act because the law of the land is H. R. 5678, and it was not Senator McCarran's bill.

Mr. MARCHISIO. It is commonly referred to by those names.

Mr. WALTER. By the people who are opposed to it. They call it the McCarran bill because they think that there is some sort of a nasty connotation. I do not know why.

Mr. MARCHISIO. Certainly you understand that our position is that every precaution and every security measure that is in the law should apply to any other law that would permit people to enter into this country.

Mr. WALTER. I know your position and I know that it must be just as objectionable to your fine organization as it is to other Americans to have these professionals make capital of the fact, that of the accident of birth.

Mr. MARCHISIO. I know Senator McCarran and I have the greatest esteem and respect for him, while I do not agree with all provisions of that law, as far as the security provisions are concerned, I think they are necessary. But the Communists and those akin to them always seize opportunities as they do in Italy today, using that very same law to tell the people that America says you are good enough to be allied with her——

Mr. WALTER. But a very responsible clergyman some time ago stated, that unless the law was repealed Italy would go Communist. He made that bold assertion.

Mr. MARCHISIO. I would say with your permission that perhaps had it not been for the President's message, the elections in Italy today—they are not overly too successful as it is from what I can gather from the latest report—might have been different.

Mr. CELLER. Judge, will you just briefly indicate what the Italian Government is doing to create employment in Italy so as to take up this slack of unemployment?

Mr. MARCHISIO. It is doing everything humanly possible within the facts that I know. But it cannot—with a total excess population that approximates some 5 million, 2 million of whom approximately are totally unemployed, some 2½ million partly unemployed, as I mentioned in my testimony earlier, a country of some 47 million in a territory less than California in size without the natural resources, for example, that California possesses, it is a miracle that this country has been able to absorb within the percentage that it has those returnees from the colonies. It is overpopulated, poor; no minerals, no gold, no silver, no iron, none of the needs of modern life are there. If it were not for the skilled handicraft work of the Italian which enables them to transmute the little they have into salable products by the ingenuity of their hands and their skill, those various skills that in some industries are so badly needed here in America. You are familiar, being from New York, with the great need in the garment industry for needleworkers. You know of the need for marble and granite cutters. You know of the need for title setters. You know that even in the chefs and waiters union there is a sad depletion.

I have spoken to labor leaders throughout the United States and I found them all, everyone of them, including Mr. Reuther, the new head of the CIO, in favor of emergency legislation to permit, always



within our national needs, a certain number of these people so necessary for our development.

Our former Secretary of Agriculture, I believe, stated, and I think I can quote him correctly, that unless we receive additional manpower in industry and very particularly agriculturally, we shall be unable to sustain our economy.

In my own State of New York you know, Mr. Celler, coming from there, that it has been necessary for the last 3 years to import migrant labor from the Bahamas and from Central America. You know that three-thousand-one-hundred-and some farms were closed last year in the State of New York because it was impossible to find agricultural workers there. Of course, New York is not one of the great agricultural States of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. I know as a matter of fact that in New York the great garment industry could use at least 10,000 Italian tailors.

Mr. MARCHISIO. They need it for the industry. I am not sure of my numbers, but without skilled needleworkers the industry will leave our State and go to other places. Australia has made tremendous increases in the production of finished cloth. Before that they only sent out the cloth. Canada has increased by permitting Italian needleworkers to come in. That is but one of the many industries spread throughout the United States that need the skilled type of help that Italy, together with the other countries mentioned, could provide if given the opportunity.

Mr. CELLER. Can you amplify a bit on the original question I asked you: how Italy is endeavoring to create work for its unemployed like, for example, the famous CASSA program?

Mr. MARCHISIO. Not only that—

Mr. CELLER. Would you amplify a bit on that?

Mr. MARCHISIO. I can speak only generally because I am not an expert, but I do know that the Minister of Public Works, the former Minister of Agriculture of Italy, Mr. Aldizio, who was in this country on two occasions learning our know-how on irrigation, the progress that has been made particularly in the south of Italy which is the poorest section of the country and the most populated, is phenomenal. I recall at the close of the war in 1945 when I was in Italy, our experts there informed Mr. Myron Taylor, with whom I was associated in the work of relief, that it would take 25 years before Italy could even begin to approach her prewar standard. Despite all these obstacles, the Italian economy has increased one-third over the prewar standard. She was, in the words of Anne O'Hare McCormick, who said in the New York Times in a featured article, that Italy was the worst devastated country in all Europe because she was bombed and shelled, naturally, by both sides. The amazing result is due to the tenacity and the will to work of the Italian people and we want people in this country who are willing to work.

If we look at our relief rolls, we will find that of all nationality groups, and this is said with no discredit to any other, fewer Italians in proportion to number receive public assistance than any other race because Italians by nature are provident; they are industrious; they like to put aside a little nest egg. They wish their children to receive an education and the proof of that is that the first generation born in this country has made tremendous strides despite the obstacles and the difficulties of language, two cultures that were dissimilar, the lack

of knowledge of their forbears; a great many of them were poor, ignorant, illiterate, but honest, hard-working people.

In our own city, Mr. Celler, the three candidates for mayor happen not only to be Americans, but Americans born in Italy, and the total Italian population in the city of New York is, as you know, 19.6 percent. Yet the 3 candidates of the 2 major parties and the other party were all Italian-born. To me, that is an indication that these, with the exception of the Republican candidates, came from the poorest of families where there were a great number of children, where the father worked late and hard at manual labor in order to give his children an opportunity to take advantage of the benefits which this country provides to those who were fortunate enough to come here.

Mr. CELLER. Do you not find, for example, that the classification, Italian tailors, stay pretty much in the garment industry; they stick there, they do not wander around and go to other cities and other jobs?

Mr. MARCHISIO. You will find that that applies to all skilled craftsmen who in their hands have an opportunity of making a decent livelihood.

Mr. CELLER. The reason for the shortage, I take it, is because of the expanding of the garment industry, because of increased population and the increased demand for goods and their immediate need for more tailors.

Mr. MARCHISIO. There is another reason. We have needlecraft schools that cost millions of dollars to erect, needlecraft schools. We seem unable in this country to train handworkers. The graduates of our needlecraft schools are excellent but they are limited to machine work on the whole. They do not seem to have the ability here to teach the skilled handwork which requires long years of apprenticeship. That is a secondary reason.

Mr. CELLER. I wanted to get a well-rounded picture of the Italian situation, Judge Marchisio.

I would like to put in the record some details of the CASSA program which has done an immeasurable amount of good for taking up the slack of unemployment in Italy concerning land reclamation, irrigation, housing, and aid to merchant marine, and so forth.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

#### WORK OF REHABILITATION IN ITALY—CREATION OF JOBS TO TAKE UP SLACK OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(Under Secretary of the Treasury Zerbi of Italy on October 24, 1952)

Developments to date in implementing the law against unemployment, Law No. 949, and the progress of staff work for the Comitato Tecnico or joint working group on public investment.

In general, we were impressed both that Mr. Zerbi himself had taken the trouble to brief himself thoroughly on the subject matter and had a rather complete command of the details and complexities involved, and also that he had a good deal of progress to report under both main headings. At the conclusion of the conversation Mr. Zerbi promised that he would send to us next week a memorandum committing to writing much of the material which he had discussed with us this morning, and inquired whether we felt this would be sufficient evidence of progress in the field of public investment and in the work of the joint working party to form a basis for releasing the initial \$40 million allotment of aid for this year. Mr. Parker replied we too were anxious to release the aid and had no desire to hold onto the money for the sheer sake of exercising our authority, but that he could not reply definitely to the question until he had seen and reviewed the memorandum and we had a chance to judge whether it gave us sufficient ammunition.

tion with which to defend a request for immediate release from Washington. I think it was clear to Mr. Zerbi that we had been impressed by what he had had to say and that we would probably consider his request for the release of aid favorably.

Mr. Zerbi divided his discussion of progress under Law 949 according to the eight major titles of that law.

#### 1. *The CASSA*

He gave no detailed review of CASSA operations but indicated that specific figures on obligations and expenditures would be available to us in a week or 10 days in connection with the staff work being done for the joint working group on public investment. He also stated that the CASSA had definitely completed its period of "breaking in" and that he felt sure that expenditures of the CASSA would reach a total of 100 billion lire during fiscal 1953. (This seems not unlikely since we have been informed informally that expenditures in fiscal 1952 of the CASSA were more than 50 billion lire, and indications are that its operations are continuing and expanding at a rapid rate.)

#### 2. *Extraordinary agricultural projects for central and north Italy*

This section of Law 949 is administered by the Ministry of Agriculture and, as Mr. Zerbi pointed out, Minister Fanfani is "formidable" when it comes to spending money for useful purposes. Fanfani has completed the administrative setup required to utilize the 25 billion lire available this year under this heading and authorizations to loan under this program have been distributed to the banks which will actually do the job, largely on the basis of the ability of particular banks to handle this kind of a program in the past but with the warning that if these funds are not rapidly and well used the bank would get no further such funds from future years' availabilities. This program is a revolving loan fund program to be carried out over several years at the rate of 25 billion lire a year, this amount to be utilized in the proportions of 10 billion for rural housing, 7½ billion for farm mechanization, and 7½ billion for irrigation projects. On the basis of requests for this money which have come in and of consultation with agricultural inspectors in the field, the Ministry now feels that there may have to be some shifts away from this pattern toward using more of the funds for housing at the expense of the other parts of the program. This will require a broad interpretation of the law which will be possible because it is a revolving loan fund extending over several years and the shifts are likely to be small. But Minister Fanfani does not wish some of this money to be immobilized under one category for lack of requests while it is badly needed for another purpose, and Mr. Zerbi agrees that some flexibility is needed.

#### 3. *Thirteen billion lire for agricultural reclamation and land-improvement projects*

This was in effect a supplementary appropriation for projects previously included in the regular budgets of the Ministry of Agriculture but which require additional funds for their completion, because of price rises, flood damage, or war damage, etc. These are projects which are already under way and progress on them will be reported under the analysis of investment projects under the regular agriculture budget discussed below.

#### 4. *The Mediocredito and*

#### 5. *the Handicraft credit fund*

Both of these institutions are on the eve of getting into operation. The appointment of the governing councils for them is the first item on the agenda of the Cabinet Credit Committee meeting for next week. The establishment of these institutions has been delayed due to complications arising from the fact that the handicraft credit fund has existed previously as a direct loan fund with one office in Rome, which limited its operations to the Rome area. It is now being reestablished as a loan discounting institution operating on a basis similar to that of the Mediocredito.

Mr. Zerbi explained the reason for the 2-year limitation on the discount of loans to the Mediocredito which he knew was bothering us. He said that this provision was inserted into the loan purposely in order to insure that the lending banks would take a continuing interest in the firms to which they had loaned money under this program and would follow up on the proper utilization of these loans. The discounts would be renewable but the 2-year limitation was put in to force a review of the loan and of the operation of the firm.

Mr. Zerbi said that he hoped the Mediocredito will be operated in such a fashion as to avoid an abuse that had developed under past Government loan

programs where the Government funds had been released directly through the lending bank. In many cases, the bank had in effect used the loan fund to refinance past loans made with its own money or had otherwise diverted the funds to other purposes. He hoped that by working through the discount procedure and by having committees of bankers ruling on the applications for discount, that an automatic check on this kind of thing would develop within the banking system.

Mr. Zerbi also mentioned another problem of banking practice which he hoped could be ameliorated through the Mediocredito operation. Frequently banks have so heavily mortgaged a firm's physical assets as security for a medium-term loan that the ability of the firm to get additional short-term commercial credit has been seriously weakened, thus in part defeating the purpose of the loan. He hoped that under the Mediocredito operation the banks could be shifted through processes of persuasion to look more at the prospects of profit and less at the physical assets of the firm when considering loans.

*6. Construction of natural gas pipeline and prospecting for hydrocarbons—20 billion lire*

Mr. Zerbi pointed out that nearly all of this money had been spent already by AGIP out of their own funds under the special authorization from the Ministry of Industry to go ahead on pipeline construction and exploration and to bill the state for the expenditures involved under this authorization. A considerable bureaucratic argument is going on on questions of accountability and whether this 20 billion lire should be paid to AGIP or held for the new Ente or government holding company for fuel operations, but in general the use of resources made possible by this appropriation has already been accomplished or is under way.

*7. Subsidies to tankers and other merchant ship construction—12 billion lire*

Mr. Zerbi gave us a brief report on progress to date under this program, translation of which is attached, which indicates that progress has been considerable. The construction of 16 tankers has already been commissioned and funds are available for another 4 or 5 and bids may be brought in for these until the 29th of November. Although the shipping companies originally estimated that a subsidy of 120,000 lire per ton would be necessary to make their costs competitive with those of British yards, the maximum subsidy per ton is set in the law at 45,000 lire and competitive bids from prospective shipowners have reduced the actual subsidy to 39,700 lire. The fact that Italian yards can deliver tankers in 18 months or whereas none would be available in less than 3 years from British yards, has resulted in lively competition among Italian shipowners for these grant funds and in the effective absorption by them of a part of the higher cost of ship construction in Italy. The Government attempted without success to have this subsidy program apply only to tankers of a standard design and tonnage, but the program is being administered by the Ministry of Merchant Marine to achieve this result, at least in part.

*8. Labor Camps, 41 billion lire*

This is a CCC type of operation for which 5 billion lire of materials are to be supplied by the Ministry of Public Works, and the remainder is available to the Ministry of Labor in addition to the 10 billion lire for this purpose in its ordinary budget. The program is under the general direction of the Ministry of Labor but close coordination is required with the Ministry of Public Works, both because of the materials required and because in many cases the local administration of works projects will be under the Ministry of Public Works. This problem of coordination has delayed the initiation of the program but now a gentleman's agreement has been achieved between the two ministries as to how to proceed and the program is ready to go ahead. The plan of distribution of work to the various localities is ready, and it is expected that virtually the entire 51 billion lire program will be accomplished during the coming 12 months, i. e., during the current election year. The advantages of this program are that it will have a very quick impact on the economy since a very high percentage of the expenditures are for pay and allowances; that it makes possible the accomplishment of a large number of small projects without going through a long procedure of approvals in the Ministry of Public Works and the accounting service of the Treasury, and that it will be carried out very largely in and on the initiative of small communes throughout the country. It is expected that a high proportion of the increased consumption which this program will make possible will go for nonfood consumer goods and thus give a significant boost to the textile and shoe industries, which are now relatively depressed. One defect of the program is that the pay and allow-

ances provided under it are sufficiently generous to attract men who are only partially employed in really depressed areas to register as unemployed in order to be eligible for the benefits of this program. Thus, there has already been in a few cases an increase in the number of registered unemployed in areas which are benefiting most from this program.

Turning to the work of the staff of the Joint Working Group on Investment, Mr. Zerbi said that the main effort so far has been to start a major investigation into the factual situation concerning existing residue. He apologized for the fact that the Government accounting system was unable to produce in short order a comprehensive and detailed picture of outstanding authorizations to spend. He remarked that in many cases accounting procedures which were established under the Monarchy in the last century are still in use and the problem of reforming the procedures of the Government was a fundamental one which was being studied but which was an extraordinarily difficult one. Even the Fascists with their authoritarian system attempted it and failed. He feels that the root of this particular problem, that of the residue, is the *competenza* type budget which is a far less modern device than the cash budget, such as is used in the United States. However, the former is fixed in European tradition and extremely difficult to modify.

He pointed out that there were several reasons why the residui had reached an extremely high level in the years since the war. In the first place, the Ministry of Public Works operated on a cash budget basis during the period of fascism, but after the war was put back on a *competenza* budget by the Court of Accounts. Since, in general, it takes about 3 years from the passage of authorizing legislation until the completion of a major public works project, this shift had meant the building up of a major pipeline of outstanding authorizations by the Ministry of Public Works during the postwar period. Secondly, the operation of the American aid program tended to increase the residui since counterpart receipts were included in the budget on a program basis, increasing active residui until actual reimbursement and deposit of counterpart took place and, in many cases, projects were included in the budget which would not have been authorized were it not for the counterpart fund and which were dependent on the actual accrual of counterpart, resulting in long timelags and the accumulation of large passive residui. Thirdly, many of the major Government investment programs during the postwar period had been subject to long-drawn-out parliamentary debate and had not been passed until late in the year or even after the end of the year to which they were attributed, thus automatically resulting in large increases in residui. Finally, there were many obligations carried over from the war period, particularly the matter of payment for forced grain collections during the war, which were at the time covered by banks but which the Government has never finally settled. The wartime destruction of records and administrative disruption of the country has made this an extremely difficult legal problem for the Government, though, at the present, legislation is in the course of passage to settle it.

He pointed out that the Treasury is attempting to meet current payments as fast as possible and also to draw down the residui as fast as possible, while operating within the frame of the present financial market situation and of a total cash deficit which can be covered by voluntary borrowing from that market.

In terms of present tactics, Mr. Zerbi pointed out that the Court of Accounts is under the constitution the competent agency to determine the extent of residui, but that it has just finished its report on the 1947-48 year and is now working on 1948-49. This agency is autonomous and within its field above the administration and, to a certain extent, jealous of its prerogatives. He has informal grants for the study being made by the staff of the joint working group, but felt he could not push it too boldly and hoped we would understand if he needed a certain flexibility of timing and tactics in getting the figures that he needed. We assured him of our understanding and support in any way possible. When the picture of outstanding residui on investment projects is fairly well completed, it will then be useful to convoke the full joint working group to consider the situation, what the possibilities are, and what recommendations should be made to the Cabinet. He pointed out that the Government is using this opportunity as a chance to go ahead and get some information which it needs for its own operation, an attitude which we welcomed.

#### NOTES FOR THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE BUDGET

The committee constituted by article 58 of the law of July 25, 1952, No. 949, providing for the development of the economy and an increase in employment, on September 1, 1952, carried out the task entrusted to it so far as concerns the competition mentioned in article 56 of said law for the construction in the Italian shipyards of tankers.

The 19 envelopes containing the bids which were sent in by the deadline of August 29, 1952, were opened, and on the basis of the 8 offers of lower quotation the committee calculated the average contribution on the part of the State which resulted as being Lit. 39,757.50 per gross ton.

On examining the applications 16 were considered acceptable for the construction of the same number of tankers of superior gross tonnage (12,000 tons) for a total of 237,900 tons.

In view of the allocation of 11,400 million lire for the construction of tankers and that in relation to the average contribution as calculated above 286,738 gross tons can be constructed, the Minister of Merchant Marine, in accordance with clause 9 of article 56, by decree dated October 8, 1952, which is about to be published in the Official Gazette, has renewed the deadline for the presentation of applications.

Together with those which will be accepted on the basis of the result of the competition, it is felt that work will be assured to all those Italian shipyards which are able to carry out these constructions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Judge.

Mr. MARCHISIO. Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

# **STATEMENT OF CLARENCE E. PICKETT, HONORARY SECRETARY FOR THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE, PHILA- DELPHIA, PA.**

Mr. GRAHAM. The next witness is Mr. Pickett.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, my name is Clarence E. Pickett. I am honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia.

Mr. WALTER. Are you a member of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born?

Mr. PICKETT. No.

Mr. WALTER. Were you ever a member of that organization?

Mr. PICKETT. No. Senator McCarran, I noticed some time ago, said that I was, and I took the trouble—I never remembered having been a sponsor in any way—so I wrote to them and got from them a statement that they could not find my name ever associated with that committee.

Mr. WALTER. Is your middle initial E?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. According to the files in the Committee on Un-American Activities, you were a member of the board of directors of that organization.

Mr. PICKETT. Well, that is a mistake. I could not remember being on that committee. One in my position has a great many connections, of course, with other organizations so I took the initiative and asked them to make a thorough search and see. I could not remember ever having been on the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Were you a speaker at the dinner of the American-Russian Institute at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes; I spoke there.

Mr. WALTER. Did you know when you spoke that that was a Communist organization?

Mr. PICKETT. Well. I don't know that it was; in fact, I still don't know that it was.

Mr. WALTER. Did you sign an advertisement just about a year ago in the San Francisco Chronicle in which issue was taken with the Supreme Court decision upholding the conviction of the 11 Communist leaders?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. You speak for the Friends Service, do you not?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The entire Friends Service?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Are you a Communist, Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. No.

Mr. HILLINGS. Were you not a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. HILLINGS. That was the organization that during the campaign—recent presidential campaign—participated rather actively in opposition to the Immigration and Nationality Code; is that not correct?

Mr. PICKETT. Well, as far as I know, that was not the emphasis of that committee. The President appointed a committee to make a study of what that committee would consider the basic legislation required—basic attitude required in legislation—concerning immigration.

Mr. WALTER. That was the committee that I have always described as the "Truman Commission To Discredit the Immigration Code."

Mr. CELLER. That is rather a gratuitous—

Mr. WALTER. I think it is gratuitous.

Mr. CELLER. That is sort of kicking a dead horse around and it is unfortunate—you do not mean that?

Mr. WALTER. Of course I mean it. The commission was set up for political reasons. Mr. Truman was flirting with minority groups in the United States and this was his way to try to get votes.

Mr. CELLER. I always appeal to minority groups and every Member of Congress does when election comes around. But Mr. Chairman, I hope that the questions that are asked will not impinge upon the statement that is submitted to us by Mr. Pickett which comes from the American Friends Service, a most creditable organization representing some of the finest citizens of our country.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Celler, to answer you, all the statements submitted will be given due consideration, carefully weighed by the committee, and there will be no prejudice, no prejudicial inference drawn from anything that is said.

Mr. WALTER. No; but I just think that it is important that we know who the witnesses are.

Now, according to this information, which comes from the files of the FBI and placed in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, this witness was a member of the board of directors of a Communist organization, an organization classified by Attorney General Francis Biddle as being Communist.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, that brings up guilt by association and you can raise a lot of questions here. I do not think that that is the proper forum to raise those questions.

Mr. WALTER. I just wanted to give Mr. Pickett an opportunity to clear the atmosphere.

Mr. CELLER. If Mr. Pickett would be given an opportunity to clear the implications involved in your questions, that is going to take a long process and I do not think it is mete or proper for us to go into all those details that you have adverted to. It would be very difficult for us to

sift the grain from the chaff. He has no counsel. By implication, charges are made against him by those questions and it is a little unfortunate. I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not pursue that questioning any further.

Mr. PICKETT. I hope my statement will be taken seriously because I have gone to the trouble to see whether there was any grounds for that and there is no ground for it that I know of.

Mr. Chairman, the American Friends Service Committee, the service arm of the Religious Society of Friends, in testifying for emergency immigration legislation would like to refer back to its statement on this subject presented to this same committee last year. That statement was made out of a religious and humanitarian concern for the victims of war and its aftermath and out of our experience in the past 36 years in nonsectarian service on their behalf.

In it we stated our conviction that the United States, with its vast resources, had an obligation to share with these unfortunates and that in so doing it would contribute to its own well-being and to the stability of the world; that important ways in which it should share were by supporting international efforts, preferably under the United Nations, for the solution of the pressing problems of refugees and surplus populations and by opening its own doors to a fair share of them; that toward this end and as a matter of basic principle our immigration laws should be revised in the direction of greater liberality and flexibility; and that experience had shown that a piecemeal, emergency approach to immigration legislation for the relief of refugee problems was disastrously slow and inadequate. In view of the failure of Congress to make the recommended changes in basic law, we urged at that time speedy enactment of special emergency legislation.

The intervening year has served to strengthen all of the convictions then expressed. As to the urgent need for action by this country to accept a reasonable number of the world's uprooted, the number of refugees and escapees of European origin alone, the group with whom present hearings are concerned, has steadily increased during this time, whereas opportunities for resettlement have been on the decline. The expiration of the Displaced Persons Act, which had resettled in this country with remarkable success, over 300,000 displaced persons and approximately 54,000 expellees, still left behind tens of thousands of displaced persons and millions of expellees. To their number have been added hundreds of thousands of new refugees from Iron Curtain countries and escapees from the East Zone of Germany. If these people do not find welcome an opportunity in the West it will mean not only individual disappointment and despair, but a general loss of confidence in the West as the defender of freedom and of individual worth. Under the general term "refugees" may also be included large numbers of persons of Italian and Greek background whom the aftermath of war has brought back to swell the already dangerously large populations of those stricken countries. Special mention should be made of the European refugees in the Middle East and China. The latter, according to first-hand observations of a member of our staff who has recently returned from the Orient, are in a position of considerable potential danger and both groups should be included in any emergency legislation that is enacted.

In view of these facts we are glad that President Eisenhower has taken the lead in urging emergency legislation and a study leading



toward further revision of basic immigration law. We feel that 240,000 special immigrants in 2 years, as suggested by the President, is a number that this country can readily absorb, as shown by the outstandingly successful experience with similar immigration under the Displaced Persons Act, and that legislation should be promptly enacted to provide for at least this number. Such legislation will mean not only offering a haven to those we accept but also providing a stimulus and encouragement to other countries to take similar steps.

In plans for immigration under a new emergency act we hope that every effort will be made to encourage distribution of the newcomers as widely as possible throughout the country. State displaced persons commissions, we feel, have played an important role in developing public interest in the displaced persons program and in encouraging resettlement opportunities widely dispersed throughout the country.

We believe that our own experience in providing, through Friends Meetings for Worship, sponsorship for displaced persons under the Displaced Persons Act is pertinent to our testimony in behalf of new emergency legislation. The Society of Friends, numerically a very small group, sponsored 234 displaced persons and Volksdeutsche families, comprising 703 individuals. While there were, of course, problems involved in these sponsorships and some disappointments in regard to those sponsored we can safely state that the number of unsatisfactory adjustments was remarkably small whereas in the vast majority of cases reports of Meetings for Worship regarding their displaced persons of Volksdeutsche families have been full of admiration and enthusiasm. The following excerpts are only illustrative of scores of favorable reports which we have received from sponsors throughout the country:

In answer to your inquiry about our DP family we can say they are fine. They are loved and respected by the community and are faithful to their work. They have a home and work here as long as they want it.

On the whole the report can be entirely favorable. Mrs. A and her two sons are all employed. The joint family income is entirely satisfactory so they have already bought on their own a new refrigerator, a washing machine, a vacuum cleaner, and other household equipment. The family has been entirely cooperative and eager to find out about life in America and all it may imply. They are now traveling every week in their own car to English classes which they all enjoy.

May I say that L. V. is still living with the group, is a stockholding member of the cooperative, and has been completely self-supporting since his first week here. He voluntarily repaid all the money which was advanced to him within a very short time, although much of it was intended as a gift.

Our family have been cooperative in attempting to adjust. They attend citizenship class at Chester twice weekly. They are saving to bring over Mr. K's brother.

For the most part, they have been cooperative in our efforts to assist them and to adjust to United States life. We have found, however, that the higher the I. Q. or the more education involved, the more difficult it is for the DP to become adjusted \* \* \*. In each case, we have loaned funds to the families involved and we have found that in each case the families have returned the loans through periodic partial payments, and within a year and a half, all loans have been repaid. (Six families were sponsored by the above.)

We have had about rockbottom minimum of problems with both our families and we trust that others who have brought families over have had as rewarding an experience as we have: \* \* \*. Financially everything is in good order. C has been earning enough to pay for complete new dentures, to send frequent parcels to members of her family in Germany, to outfit herself and her child practically from head to foot and to save something in addition. Furthermore, for as long ahead as anyone can see, there will always be a demand for the kind of reliable cook-general that she is. She has Blue Cross and Blue Shield insurance for them both.

Members of the Friends Church had only words of joy and praise for the J. S. family, which arrived on October 25, 1950. A house has been furnished for them and he is working at the Carmel Screw Works. They are deeply grateful people and are really meaning a tremendous lot to both the Friends group and wider community.

A better than average workman in the beginning, Mike has steadily improved as he came to know what was required of him, while Martha has made her way into the hearts of many friends. Little 8-month-old Stephen contributes much to their apparent happiness. Intelligent, conscientious, and adaptable, they have made excellent progress and, at the end of a year and 5 months, fit into the life of the community very well, and we feel will make worthy and useful citizens of the country they are already planning to adopt.

We feel that there is every reason to believe that refugees, expellees, and escapees admitted under new legislation would establish equally satisfactory records and that in providing, in the best American tradition, haven for our share of these homeless people we will not only be contributing to the solution of one of the most urgent of postwar problems but also adding able and valuable future citizens to the American population. We regret deeply the fact that no emergency legislation on behalf of refugees and expellees was passed by the last Congress and feel that it would be tragic if the present Congress should fail to act decisively for the alleviation of the crucial human problem involved.

I have gone over the testimony of the three major religious groups: Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant. I know what they have said and I do not want to repeat too much, although perhaps for emphasis' sake I might give a little of the background out of which my comments come.

Since the First World War, as a matter of fact, our organization has dealt with the results of major population movements in terms of refugees, and what I say comes out of that experience. The upsetting and disturbing international implications of large population movements, whatever the cause may be, and especially with the Yalta and Potsdam agreements which required people of German ancestry to move out of the countries to the east, has, as I am sure you have been informed, presented Germany, what we usually call West Germany, with an extremely difficult problem of about 10 million people, or on a conservative estimate, you might say 8 million—nobody knows quite how many—coming into their country, and with a truncated country of one-fifth of their territory in East Germany, and with their industry pretty well battered and their housing, a good deal of it, destroyed.

It is quite sure that the agreement was that they should be a charge on the German economy and yet the German economy has not been able to absorb. I think myself they have done far more than any of us expected they could in absorbing that influx. By the testimony of those who are in charge of the Bonn government, to whom I talked not too long ago, they have absorbed about a third of them. They have absorbed to some extent about another third and there is still one-third not absorbed, partly because they live where there is no employment and employment localities do not have proper housing.

We have been working to some extent with them on that problem. But they are people of industry and for the most part, health, and are, with the protection provided for sending in for people who want to come here, we think from our contract with them working in their camps, and in other ways, that they are a fine kind of person, prospective citizen, for this country.

I do not want to pause long on the other major areas of disturbance. They are the Arab refugees from the Arab-Israeli war and, of course, the Chinese intellectuals who left China as the Communists took over the mainland of China and went mostly to Hong Kong. I notice Mr. Judd is greatly concerned about them as we are concerned about them. I would hope that consideration would be given to that situation as well as to a number of White Russians who are living in Hong Kong, principally in Hong Kong, still refugees from the First World War. I do not speak with too intimate information about this. I know they are there, but what condition they are in I am not able to say in detail but it all presents a picture of, oh, I suppose, not counting the people who have been displaced in India and Pakistan, 15 million or whatever you want to say—nobody knows quite the number.

Now, we cannot handle all of that, of course. We have, however, two responsibilities, it seems to me: One, to do what we can from the humanitarian point of view; and the other, I hope that this committee realizes that the action we take here does influence the action of other countries in the world. If we tighten up, then they tend to tighten up. If we are a little bit more generous, they tend to be a little more generous, and Australia's action not too long ago I think is an evidence of that. Whether they ought to or not, I am not discussing that question at all; but I do think that the President has been well advised to suggest that we might admit 240,000 people in 2 years, partly because of the influence of these people on the stability of the world at this time and our ability to contribute to that stability by removing some of the restlessness due to refugees and whatever, by whatever term they may be called, people who are away from home due to their rootlessness.

I think it is not necessary for me to comment on the effect of immigration into this country. It is a point emphasized over and over again and I endorse fully what has been said by others in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interrupt, please. As I have pointed out, we are working against time. Will you cut it as short as you can? We want to hear your story and in no wise cut you off, but we must hear other witnesses.

Mr. PICKETT. I will be through in 1 or 2 minutes.

I want to comment on the work of the Commission that Mr. Walter referred to. As to receptiveness in this country, we were conscious we might be accused of trying to hear only one side of the case and I am confident I would not be a party to that myself, and I think no other member of that Commission would be. We tried to get from people who favored restriction as well as those who favored greater immigration. The thing that impressed me as a member of that Commission was the very great enthusiasm that had been built up around the special group that came in under the Displaced Persons Act. Sometimes an individual family would come in and say, representing a church, just some layman would come in and say, our church sponsored so and so and it has been the best lift that our church has had. We felt that we participated in something that was important and the family has made good. That happened: Catholic, Protestant, and the like in, I would suppose, scores of cases and counted them up, but certainly the impression was inevitable upon a Commission who heard that reiterated over and over, I think

the way in which that special legislation was handled was an indication of how we can spread population of this sort over the country and I am sure that the voluntary agencies would willingly again participate in that process. Whether it would be done by building up State committees as was done before, which I think was very good, as far as I know, very satisfactory and useful, I would think it ought to be done; but also, I am sure of this, that the use of the voluntary agencies, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and other, a wide range of others, their experience with that 340,000 brought in, 400,000 authorized, is a body of experience of great importance and I hope that it will not be lost in this thinking.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to make one statement briefly, Mr. Chairman. I just want to compliment the distinguished and very efficient, conscientious workers that you have in the field, men like William Staber in Rome, and others in Munich, Berlin, and Geneva. I found them exceptionally helpful when I was over there recently on this question.

Mr. PICKETT. I hope it will continue to be true, Mr. Celler.

Mr. WALTER. We recognized that fact when we employed your Betty Barton to assist this committee. She did a very, very fine job.

Mr. PICKETT. She is working in Germany now.

Mr. WALTER. I just want to ask one question. You state that the President was well advised when he made this recommendation. Actually, this recommendation was Truman's recommendation. The bill that we have before us is the same legislation that Mr. Celler introduced at the last Congress at the request of the then President of the United States.

Mr. PICKETT. It is also the recommendation of President Eisenhower.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, there is some good that the Democratic Party does.

Mr. WALTER. We must not let these people overlook that.

You have attributed this situation in Germany to the Potsdam agreement.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Walter, may I say that I had a note here and should have included that. The present situation is due largely to whatever they call them, people coming from East Germany, Communist Germany, into West Germany.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call your attention to the fact that before Potsdam, years before Potsdam, these forcible expulsions were taking place. I visited a camp in Bavaria in which all of the inhabitants had been kicked out of their homes in Yugoslavia 2 years before Potsdam. You see, there is just too much of that attributing all of this confusion to Potsdam.

Mr. PICKETT. I have no answer to that. I quite agree.

You are restricting me somewhat as to time and I know that very well.

Mr. WALTER. I just want to keep the record straight.

Mr. GRAHAM. We try to treat all the witnesses fairly. We must close today.

The next witness is Mr. Abraham Multer.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE  
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

May I first express my appreciation to the committee for permitting me to appear this morning and make a brief statement?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are glad to have you, indeed.

Mr. MULTER. I am authorized to make this statement not only on my own behalf but on behalf of our colleagues, Congressmen Dollinger, Fine, Holtzman, and Klein.

They would like to come in here and say the same things I will say to you this morning but other committee assignments keep them away and they have asked me to make this statement on their behalf as well as my own.

We are heartily in favor of the early enactment of the bill that you are considering and want to compliment the committee for taking such speedy action in response to the President's request for legislation of this kind.

I might say that a large part of the groups of people that are covered by this proposed bill find very few of their co-nationals, shall I say, within our respective districts. Nevertheless, we are in hearty approval of the principle set forth here. We do not think it goes quite far enough. In that we differ with other Members of the Congress with reference to that but with all legislation, I think, it is a matter of compromise. We think this is good compromise in the right direction and we urge early approval of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Multer. Do you care to submit to any questions or do you want to depart as you are?

Mr. MULTER. I will be glad to try to answer any question. I am sure this committee, because of its very great experience with the problem, has the answers already at hand but if it wants any confirmation of some of those questions from me, I will be glad to add it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I rarely take any part in this because I think the other members should but I wanted to give you this information. We are anxious to bring out a bill as quickly as we can. We are working against a target set by the administration leaders. If this bill is to be enacted, we must get it out quickly and that is the reason we are putting on the emphasis and the speed that we are, not to shut off any witness but simply to arrive at our target and get it out.

Mr. WALTER. Did you not contemplate having a day for Members of the House?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, yes; we can do that. But we want to get the opposing viewpoints.

Mr. MULTER. My colleagues for whom I am speaking this morning, and I, were under the impression that this would be the last day of our public hearings.

Mr. GRAHAM. We had expected to be through yesterday and carried over to today.

Mr. MULTER. I think you will get wholehearted support from our colleagues in what you are doing here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you very much, sir.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN CERVASE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,  
COLUMBIAN CIVIC CLUB OF NEW JERSEY**

Mr. CERVASE. Mr. Chairman, I am John Cervase, executive secretary of the Columbian Civic Club of New Jersey and past president of Unico National. I represent the Columbian Civic Club of New Jersey and Unico National, both service clubs composed of business and professional people. The former is statewide in its influence and program; the latter is national with chapters in 17 States.

Both organizations do charity, award scholarships, and engage in civic activity on a local, State, and National level. None of our members is paid for the service he performs for these organizations. I am not being paid for being here today and, in fact, have come here on my own time and at my own expense. Our only reward is the satisfaction that comes from rendering service to our communities, to our country, and to our less fortunate neighbors. Our charity and service is not confined to any one group or creed.

There are two reasons for my coming here today: One is to plead for changes in the McCarran-Walter Act, and the second is to request that this committee consider some form of emergency legislation similar to that outlined in the bill introduced by Mr. Watkins on May 15.

As concerns the McCarran-Walter Act, we are opposed to the quota provisions and the national origins theory which form an integral part of the law. There are other objections but time compels me to confine myself to these. We leave it to Congress to decide what the annual quota should be but we urge that an equitable distribution be enacted, based upon merit rather than national origin. There should be a total annual quota which would fluctuate with our manpower needs.

When we begin to favor immigrants from one country and restrict those from others, we do an injustice to valuable allies and to the members of ethnic groups who are American citizens.

If we would give Italy, for example, a quota equivalent to the British quota, I am sure we could find 65,000 qualified Italians with all the attributes of loyalty and good citizenship who would migrate to the United States. But we do not ask for that many. We merely ask that the unused quotas of high-quota countries be redistributed to low-quota countries that have oversubscribed their quotas.

It seems to me that our first concern should be to bring 154,000 first-rate immigrants here annually rather than to just invite 65,000 British or 25,000 Germans or 17,000 Irish and so on. To those who desire to maintain the Anglo-Saxon texture of America may I remind them that the Anglo-Saxons themselves have failed to fulfill this desire because they have barely used half their allotted annual quotas. And so, too, other favored countries have failed to use their full quotas.

None of us wants to subject America to the risks and dangers that the restrictionists fear. We maintain that there is as much risk and danger in admitting Anglo-Saxons as there is in admitting Latins. But this is an illusory fear because out of tens of millions of people who populate Europe alone, we can easily find 154,000 annually that we can admit with safety. And we maintain, for example, that there are many times more than 5,600 Italian immigrants annually who

would respect, preserve, and defend our institutions and our way of life. Conversely, there could be an equal number of north Europeans who would come here as immigrants and set about to change things for the worse.

But I did not come here to praise Italians nor to disparage others. Their records in helping build America is established. I came to bury some erroneous impressions about the millions who support my position.

Although we have given billions of dollars in aid to countries of southern Europe, we have neglected to encourage their economic recovery by offering them an outlet for their surplus population. The problem is serious and is fraught with danger for us and those countries. Their continued suffering from the ravages of social and economic disorders because of living under overcrowded conditions constitutes an ever-increasing threat of political upheaval in those countries where we are spending billions for economic aid. Escapees from communism have aggravated this problem.

The immigration problem stems basically from man's struggle for land and the wealth it produces. It is no strange coincidence that today's international problems have their roots buried deeply in this age-old struggle. Alleviation of the suffering in overpopulated countries depends largely on our approach to the immigration problem.

From the day the first colonists set foot in America, the restrictionists have contended that the newly forming ethnic group known as Americans who then migrated from Britain and northwestern Europe were peculiarly qualified to be Americans. All others were not.

It is this concept of American citizenship that lends support to our restrictive immigration system based upon national origin rather than individual merit of the immigrant. By mere accident of birth some peoples are qualified to become Americans, others are not. This is the logical reasoning of the restrictionists who would bar others from coming to these shores.

The basic American stock, they claim, is formed by the colonists who came from Britain and northwestern Europe before 1790. All who came thereafter were immigrants. This is an arbitrary distinction which creates a convenient argument for the national origins theory, deeply imbedded in our law.

But this argument is not true to fact. The heritage of culture and civilization bequeathed by the Romans and their descendants to northwestern Europe, to the United States and to the entire world qualifies them to be Americans, too. The basic American stock possesses no greater qualifications for American citizenship than others. Good and bad are universal traits. For example, documents relating to the colonial history of New York show that it was the practice of north European nations to empty their almshouses and jails and ship their paupers and criminals to America in the colonial period. Maryland passed a law in 1676 imposing a fine on shipowners engaged in transporting criminals and paupers. Pennsylvania passed a law in 1772 imposing a tax on criminals landed and making the shipowners responsible for their good conduct. It was estimated that 50,000 criminals from England alone arrived in the colonial period. This was almost a century before south Europeans began coming here.

Thomas Jefferson is quoted as having expressed the wish that there were "an ocean of fire between this country and Europe so that it

might be impossible for any more immigrants to come hither." In those days none came from southeastern Europe.

By 1860 this traffic had been controlled. Twenty years later south Europeans started migrating to America. They were law-abiding people who left their homelands to better their lot in the new world as did the immigrants of the colonial period. They made real contributions to American life and culture and their descendants today take their share of credit for the development and progress America has achieved. Time has proven that they were the builders of America.

The first immigration law was passed in 1798 designed to stop the flow of criminal and pauper traffic from northwestern Europe.

In 1850 the Know Nothing Party organized and sponsored laws permitting only natives to hold Government jobs and requiring immigrants to live here 21 years before they could become citizens.

The national origins formula was enacted in 1924 and became law in 1929. In a Senate speech in February 1929, Senator McCormack stated that the law was discriminating if not insulting; that the underlying motive was un-American.

President Hoover, in his acceptance speech in 1928, stated that he was a member of the Commission to determine quotas and favored repeal of the national origins formula. He and the Secretaries of State, Labor, and Commerce informed President Harding in 1927 that the quotas, as computed by them were based on statistical and historical information which raised grave doubts as to the value of their computations. Despite this, quotas were established in favor of Britain and countries of northwestern Europe.

Last year, in a Senate debate, Mr. McCarran said:

A sound immigration and naturalization system is essential to the preservation of our way of life because that system is the channel through which a stream of humanity flows into the reservoir of American society. If that stream is polluted, our institutions and our way of life become infected.

The implication here is that immigrants from low quota countries pollute the stream. This is not true.

At a time when we are spending billions to rehabilitate those countries of Europe, the restrictionists would not relieve their suffering from overpopulation by letting them send their immigrants here in numbers at least equivalent to the unused quotas of Britain and northwestern Europe.

Unemployment and overpopulation in those countries lie at the root of their economic ills and are threatening to drive valuable allies into the open arms of communism. In rejecting those peoples we place a dangerous obstacle in the road to victory over the forces communism.

I would like to make the following recommendations:

First, that Congress fix an annual overall quota which would fluctuate depending on our manpower needs.

Second, that an equitable distribution of the quota be made based on individual merit rather than on national origin.

Third, that the national origins law be abolished.

Fourth, that unused quotas be redistributed among countries that have oversubscribed their quotas.

Fifth, that emergency legislation be enacted to authorize 240,000 escapees, expellees, and nationals of Italy, Greece and the Netherlands to enter the United States.



Mr. WALTER. I notice that your entire statement is an attack on the McCarran-Walter Act. Before going into that, you stated:

As concerns the McCarran-Walter Act, we are opposed to the quota provisions and the national-origins theory which form an integral part of the law.

Then you say:

There are other objections but time compels me to confine myself to these.

I would like to hear the other objections.

Mr. CERVASE. The other objections are minor compared——

Mr. WALTER. What are they?

Mr. CERVASE. On questions of procedure.

Mr. WALTER. On what?

Mr. CERVASE. On questions of procedure before the Immigration Appeals Board and before the consuls in respective countries, the authority and power and the discretion given to them to deny visas to one and grant to another because he might suspect that this individual might turn out to be a bad American.

Mr. WALTER. I hope that is not your impression of the law because that is not the law.

Mr. CERVASE. I have read the Congressional Record throughout its entirety, Mr. Walter, and——

Mr. WALTER. Whose statement in the record did you read?

Mr. CERVASE. Yours and Mr. McCarran's.

Mr. WALTER. I know some statements that are absolutely inaccurate.

For instance, I heard Senator Lehman say that a person could be deported for violation of a traffic ordinance.

Mr. CERVASE. I read that, too.

Mr. WALTER. That is not true.

Mr. CERVASE. I did not believe that.

Mr. WALTER. And neither are most of the attacks made on it. They are made largely by professionals and fellow travelers and lawyers representing ship jumpers or Communists who are disturbed over the possibility of being deported.

Mr. CERVASE. Let me say this, Mr. Walter. I represent these two civic organizations. I am not a professional. There is nobody on the staff of either of these organizations that gets paid for the work he does. I am down here on my own time and at my own expense and we are coming here strictly in the interests of trying to help Congress come out with a bill which will suit all Americans.

Mr. WALTER. Then I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he confine his statement to the legislation under consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. You beat me to it.

Mr. HILLINGS. I wonder if I could ask a question which bears on the two subjects which have been mentioned both the legislation and, the Immigration and Nationality Code. Do you think, Mr. Cervase, that this proposed legislation will actually weaken to some degree the McCarran-Walter Act?

Mr. CERVASE. You mean this emergency bill that is pending?

Mr. HILLINGS. That is correct.

Mr. CERVASE. Weaken it?

Mr. HILLINGS. Yes.

Mr. CERVASE. I do not see how it can, in my opinion. I think that the bill is a piece of legislation that ought to be passed because

it is going to help these countries of Europe that are suffering from overpopulation.

Mr. HILLINGS. Do you think that the passage of this proposed emergency legislation will affect the McCarran-Walter immigration code in any way?

Mr. CERVASE. I do not see from the superficial study I have made of the question from that particular angle how it will.

Mr. HILLINGS. Do you not think that the question of this legislation and the McCarran-Walter code are entirely separate?

Mr. CERVASE. Yes, they are; but there are some arguments that I think are common to both.

Mr. HILLINGS. I might suggest as one member of the committee that the quickest way for you or anyone else interested in the passage of this emergency legislation to sabotage it and prevent congressional action on it, is to attempt to use the legislation to attack and get around the McCarran-Walter Act because if that is the purpose of supporting the emergency legislation, I doubt if the Congress is going to take any favorable action, so I hope that you can make your position clear.

Mr. CERVASE. May I explain that, Mr. Hillings? When the arrangements were made for me to come down here to testify, I was informed by others not connected with this committee that I would be here principally to urge the passage of this emergency legislation. But also to make some statements regarding the McCarran-Walter Act because eventually that is coming up for consideration.

Mr. WALTER. Who said so?

Mr. CERVASE. I was told that, sir.

Mr. GRAHAM. As you know, there has been a joint committee of the Senate and the House for the purpose of studying the workings of the McCarran-Walter Act and making recommendations. All through this hearing we have sought to confine ourselves to the emergency features as suggested by the President and if you will do that, sir—

Mr. CERVASE. I would be very happy to.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to make one comment that flows from the question asked by Mr. Walter. I do not want the record to stand without comment from me because it might be inferred that I had agreed with what Mr. Walter said concerning those opposed to the McCarran-Walter Act. He made some characterization concerning the opposition and I want to state that they are well-meaning, well-intentioned groups and individuals who are also opposed and I am opposed and I do not want to come within that characterization made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. You are just a professional legislator.

Mr. CERVASE. All I would like to say, and especially to Mr. Walter is, that I am here in a spirit of cooperation and to try to aid legislation which I think should be beneficial to the entire country.

Mr. WALTER. Did I understand your statement a moment ago? You said that this legislation will help countries in Europe. I would like to hear wherein it would help the United States.

Mr. CERVASE. One of my recommendations tells you that we feel that we have certain manpower needs in this country here today and certainly if we can get 75,000 Italian or 110,000 East Germans, whatever they are, to come here—and we could screen them and get

people who are needed here for our manpower purposes, I see that will definitely help our country.

Mr. WALTER. What about the 50,000 that left my section of Pennsylvania because of lack of work opportunities? How can we help those people?

Mr. CERVASE. It may be in your section of the country there just is not available employment. There certainly is available employment in many other sections of the country. It does not seem to be equalized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let us find more uses for coal and Pennsylvania will not be denuded of its very fine citizenry.

Mr. CERVASE. I think, too, that we, for example, have been sending billions of dollars over to Europe and other parts of the world for economic aid and it seems to me that according to statistics, that for every 100,000 people that we could import into the United States under this special legislation, we would save approximately a billion dollars in economic aid.

You gentlemen know the arguments. There is no point in my repeating them all. I come here strictly to let you know my organization would like something to be done about this thing and we favor this legislation which is pending before you now.

Mr. GRAHAM. We appreciate that. May I say to you that most of the members on this committee have served from 8 to 10 to 12 years and we are familiar with these problems and we probably do not know all the answers but we know a number of them. We are glad to have your interest thus expressed.

Mr. CERVASE. One more thing. I feel that one way this legislation or even amendment of certain parts of the McCarran-Walter Act could help the United States would be that certainly if we would take people of so-called minority groups in this country and make them feel as though they are as good as any other American in the country, that would help the country, tend to create unity and happiness, and tend to make everybody feel on an equal footing with everybody else.

The statement is more or less sociological and historical rather than technical or legal. You fellows know the real argument better than I do and it would be a waste of time for me to repeat to you the sociological and the historical aspects we are prone to forget.

Mr. WALTER. Do you not think that an organization such as yours could make a great contribution within the movement just spoken about by putting on an educational program, point out to these groups what it is that causes what you say is antiminority feeling?

Mr. CERVASE. We are doing that, Mr. Walter, for your information and we do not seem to agree on some of those causes. That is the very point of controversy here and I have gone into that lightly here. But I would be very happy, Mr. Walter, to have any of the arguments you have got to propose on that score and we would be glad to disseminate those arguments, but we feel they must be unbiased and must be fair arguments in support of your particular position; and if you go into the historical background or the sociological background of minority groups in this country and go right back to the tribal days, I think you will agree with me, Mr. Walter, that we are all created equal, and in America, an American from

England is no better than an American from Greece, Italy, or anywhere else.

Mr. WALTER. No; but they are different.

Mr. CERVASE. They are different.

Mr. WALTER. It may well be that the difference is the reason why we have progressed to the point where we have progressed. I do not know. It may be that. But we have done pretty well with the kind of bloodstream that we have.

Mr. CERVASE. That is where we violently disagree, Mr. Walter. I only wish time would permit me to try to show you where you are wrong in that concept. I can quote from history and from records and from documents relating to the colonial history of New York and from immigration records and so on.

Mr. GRAHAM. History is looking down on you right now.

Mr. CERVASE. I know it is.

I would be glad to communicate with you, Mr. Walter, and if there are any other arguments you have got to quote to me which I can disseminate, with which I would agree—

Mr. CELLER. Don't the Sons of Italy and your own organization spread themselves throughout the Nation to cover the very items that Mr. Walter refers to?

Mr. CERVASE. I am on a speaking tour right now. I have been traveling the length and breadth of the land addressing our members and chapters across the country for the last 3 years on this very matter. I have gone into it from a sociological and historical viewpoint rather than a technical or legal standpoint. From that standpoint, I do not see how you can sustain your position, Mr. Walter.

Mr. WALTER. What position?

Mr. CERVASE. The position that you just said, that the bloodstream it has is better because—

Mr. WALTER. Now you have deliberately misquoted me. I did not say such a thing. I said, it may be the reason; I do not know. But you see, you are doing what everybody does, they deliberately misquote me to make out a statement to sustain their own position, but I won't argue with you.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you very much, sir.

The next witness is Mr. James Finucane.

#### STATEMENT OF JAMES FINUCANE, ASSOCIATE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR

Mr. FINUCANE. Mr. Chairman, in the mimeographed statement I have submitted, which I do not intend to read, as you request, it is pointed out that the United States has responsibility for, a primary responsibility, for the 10 million expellees in Western Germany, and that this responsibility stems from before the Potsdam agreement and stems from a promise made by President Roosevelt to the exiled Polish Government that he would support the transfer of populations from the territory taken away from the Germans at the end of the war into Germany. That responsibility we have for the expellees and we have an additional responsibility for the escapees who are coming in now because we are, to use the most colorful word, "luring" them out from behind the Iron Curtain. Therefore, we should do something, if possible, in a token way to take care of the ones we are bringing out.

Now, the German population is increasing solely through the influx of expellees at the rate of 400,000 this year. It is expected to be 400,000 by the end of this year. This bill provides 50,000 a year for 2 years for the category which includes this group. Therefore, it is only a token. I think that those two points dealing with our responsibility for these persons and dealing with the fact that conditions are bad and growing worse, point up the desirability of passing the bill.

Now, there are two comments I would like to make on the practicality of the bill as it is written. One deals with the section in the bill which requires that persons to be eligible for admission must be persecuted and unable to return from where they came. That would be self-defeating, at least as far as the expellees and escapees are concerned because the figure available to us indicates that only 4 or 5 percent of the persons who are coming across the border now and for the past year come in the category of persons who are threatened with loss of life or liberty.

Therefore, I think that provision should be modified and that, in addition to the present language of the bill which requires that a person has come over because of persecution, and so forth, that also a person who, because of "a positive option for democracy as a way of life"——

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interrupt you for a moment? You are speaking, of course, to the bill in the Senate, introduced by Senator Watkins, while we do not have this bill before us. We have a number of other bills and we are hearing the testimony with the idea of writing a bill. We are glad to get your suggestions and criticisms but we are not bound to one particular bill. I want you to know that.

Mr. FINUCANE. Thank you.

Mr. CELLER. On that score, about those who came over for causes other than religious or racial persecution. For example, in West Berlin, they screened those who come over from East Berlin who are so-called escapees and they become those who are recognized escapees and those who are not recognized. The nonrecognizable one cannot get work in Berlin.

As you say, there are about 5 percent of those, roughly, probably a little less than 5 percent; sometimes they come over because of marital difficulties. Youths come over because of their inability to get along with their parents. There is no religious or racial persecution involved.

However, there are so many of those who come over for recognized, so-called recognizable reasons, that the numbers we put in the bill would be far less than those who come over in that recognized category. We cannot help everybody. So we have to make a differentiation.

Mr. FINUCANE. Mr. Celler my impression, which is based on fairly reliable sources, is that the percentage is just the opposite of what you cite.

Mr. CELLER. I emphatically disagree with you. You say there are 95 percent of those who are what they call nonrecognizable cases?

Mr. FINUCANE. The disposition that the German Government makes of them is a separate question. But it indicates their status, the reasons for which they came over.

Mr. CELLER. Where did you get that information?

Mr. FINUCANE. The latest version of it is from the May 30 issue of Die Neue Züricher Zeitung in Switzerland, which is well known as a German-language newspaper, widely read in Germany, and is a reliable source.

Mr. CELLER. I must take exception to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let the witness finish.

Mr. FINUCANE. Mr. Celler, I think that we agree in a way but it is a question of terminology. It is due to the fact that the way the committee print, one of the prints that the committee is considering, gives a rather restricted definition which I think, strictly interpreted, would exclude 95 percent of the escapees. Instead there, I would suggest the language which I mentioned, that the adequate ground for eligibility would be because that person "had made a personal option for democracy."

Mr. WALTER. They are the new arrivals, principally from Germany.

Mr. FINUCANE. Almost overwhelmingly, yes; Berlin is almost inaccessible to others.

Mr. WALTER. If that is a fact, why is it that as of this minute there are 600 unused German quota visas available for those very people.

Mr. FINUCANE. I understand that administratively the United States officials make a residence requirement in Western Berlin, if that is the group you are referring to.

Mr. WALTER. That is not the fact. These people are eligible for admission under the German quota because under our system their eligibility is determined by the place of birth. They were born in Germany.

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Therefore, no matter where they apply from, they are chargeable to the German quota. There will be wasted, to use Mr. Celler's favorite expression, 600 German quota numbers this year. What I want to know is, why don't they?

Mr. FINUCANE. I would imagine because of the administration of the act.

Mr. WALTER. In what respect?

Mr. FINUCANE. I show you an example. I have tried to sponsor an immigrant who is coming in and I sent the papers over for him about a month ago and have not gotten either an acknowledgment of its receipt or any response at all.

Mr. WALTER. That does not prove anything. Maybe they have not been able to catch up with the man.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is possible. I do not know, Mr. Walter; is there some legal impediment?

Mr. WALTER. You are the witness. I do not know. I know there are available 600 German immigrant visas as of this minute.

Mr. FINUCANE. I do know that this West Berlin situation has been pointed out to me; somewhere on the form that the intending immigrant must fill out to come to the United States he has to state his address and if he does not have an address, for example—to go back to this 95 percent, they do not have, 95 percent of them, or even if it is not that high—

Mr. WALTER. That just is not the fact because I have seen them do this: they give the address of the reception center that is the address put on the application. We saw many of them. And then no matter where they do go, they use that address as a permanent address.

Mr. FINUCANE. I have been a little bit mystified by these figures because I have seen them in the compilation, in one of the compilations made by the Congress, I saw the figures that there was a backlog of something like 500,000 applicants for admission to the United States. Then I think it was in the report of the President's Commission or some other later report, the statement that indicated that there was no waiting time for applicants and that therefore there was probably a large quota.

Mr. WALTER. The Rosenfield Commission?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I would like to ask a question on that score. Yes, there are 600 visas, quota numbers, rather, that are available to Germans. Now, ethnic Germans are not born in Germany, are they?

Mr. FINUCANE. As I understand, under the specific definition made by the State Department, they are not born in the present boundaries of Germany.

Mr. CELLER. Therefore, since they were born in Poland or Russia or the Baltic countries, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, they could not come in under the German quota, is that correct? You must be born in Germany to come in under the German quota?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. As I understand, since these are not native-born Germans, they cannot come in under the German quota?

Mr. FINUCANE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CELLER. I do not know whether I can put these in the record. These are photographs which I took at the time I was in the refugee centers in West Berlin.

Hardly any of these were native Germans. They were all escapees, most of them that I had seen, from Czechoslovakia, so that the reason for the 600 unused quota numbers is that the Germans are well satisfied. The German natives are integrated into the economy of West Germany. They have been given jobs; great preference has been given to them. But ethnic Germans whom we are trying to help cannot come under the German quotas and they are the ones who are crowding the refugee centers, together with the recent escapees in a goodly portion from Czechoslovakia, considerable from Poland, and considerable from the Baltic provinces.

Therefore, to say that 600 are not used as the reason for militation against this bill to my mind would be vain. Those refugees cannot use those quota numbers because they are not eligible because of the code which says the country of birth governs quota.

Mr. WALTER. What you say is based on a false assumption that everybody is coming from outside of Germany, and what we were talking about were the people born in Germany. Actually, is it not a fact that they are leaving because of the land reform and all of the laws imposed on them by the Russians? And they are leaving because they do not want to produce for the Communists? Is that not a fact?

Mr. FINUCANE. That is part of the fact. The other fact is, it looks better over here.

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. FINUCANE. Greener pastures.

Mr. CELLER. Also because, and I can speak German and I was able to speak to the Czechs through an interpreter—for example, in

Czechoslovakia they are given a quota to raise certain number of pigs under that quota. The quota is fixed so high that if they cannot raise it, then the farm on which they raise the pigs, for example, must be collectivized. Anticipating that punishment because they cannot fulfill their quota, they seek to escape. That holds true with cattle, with reference to beet sugar. I mentioned pigs and cattle and beet sugar because some refugees I saw that particular morning on Fischer Strasse were in that classification.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right. In addition to that, the RIAS broadcasts every day into those areas keeping them disturbed, telling them it is better over here, that they are going to send you to the uranium mines, or have a currency reform next Saturday. They want to come over and we are spreading propaganda behind the Iron Curtain. In addition to the repressive measures taken by their own Communist government, there is this bait put out by our propaganda.

Mr. CELLER. It is quite true. Therefore, could the inference be drawn from your statement, and if it is, it seems unfair, that they want to come over because they like conditions better over here? Is it not because the conditions under which they live in Communist-dominated areas, those conditions are intolerable.

Mr. FINUCANE. I do not know whether they are intolerable but they prefer western democracy, that is clear, for one reason or another because—whether it is because of the economic grounds or whatever they are.

Mr. WALTER. In that, they are not different from everybody all over the world. Everybody wants to come to the United States.

Mr. FINUCANE. That is right. That is why whatever language is finally adopted should include a provision giving that as a ground for eligibility. That is "an option for democracy."

Mr. CELLER. Everybody does not want to come. The mere fact that the Germans do not want to come, and you have 600 unused numbers, indicates that in West Germany the Germans are eminently satisfied; conditions are booming in West Germany. There is bounce and energy, more building going on in those cities like Frankfurt, Munich, and Bonn, than I have seen in any other cities in Europe.

Mr. FINUCANE. I would differ with you on that on two grounds, Mr. Celler. First of all, the approximately 4 million Volksdeutsch in the 10 million figure that was mentioned. That is the ethnic Germans. They are ineligible for migration as German nationals. So that is 4 million present residents who cannot apply for those 600 visas.

Mr. CELLER. That is what I have been trying to tell you.

Mr. GRAHAM. He understands you.

Mr. FINUCANE. There is a population pressure there and it is not being relieved, partly because of that legal situation, as under our national origin system quota, they cannot come; and secondly, there is also the financial straits in which most of those persons are. They do not have money to pay their transportation to a port; they do not have money to pay carfare to an American consul to register; and if they have both of those, they do not have money for ocean transportation.

Mr. CELLER. Wait a minute now. I have to take issue with you on that. Those who come over and those who are recognizable under the conditions laid down by the Berlin Government are transported to the extent of 90 percent; 90 percent are transported to West Germany



and we are supplying the air lifts. I just discussed that with Under Secretary of State Bedell Smith. We are supplying the air lifts to take them out of Berlin into West Germany where the West German Government is doing a remarkable job in integrating them into the economy of Germany.

Mr. FINUCANE. I think the figure is all but 3 million have been integrated.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interrupt? We have two more witnesses. Have you finished your statement?

Mr. FINUCANE. I would just like to make one more point dealing with the pooled number of 110,000 quota numbers for expellees and refugees which are lumped together in one group in the committee print.

Mr. BESTERMAN. We are not bound by that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The chairman has made clear that here are 10 bills before us and we are not bound by any one.

Mr. FINUCANE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that, whatever distribution you make of the final refugee quotas, you take into consideration the figures which are on this chart.

Mr. GRAHAM. They will be given due consideration. I do not say we will be bound by them.

Is there anything further?

The next witness then, if you please.

(The prepared statement and chart of Mr. Finucane is as follows:)

#### LET'S FACE OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE EXPELLEES

Testimony of James Finucane, associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, on the President's proposal for 240,000 emergency immigration visas before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Washington, D. C., June 10, 1953

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we want to support this bill with some reservations and amendments. To the extent that it deals with the expellees and escapees it can be a first step toward recognition of the duty we have to take care of the 9 million people whom we, as a Nation, have made homeless.

First I would like to demonstrate our historic responsibility for the expellees.

Attempts are often made to excuse America from responsibility for the expulsions. One committee of this very House, in a report after the war, said, in effect: "The United States only agreed to an evil which was already in process, which could not be prevented. We managed to add a stipulation that they be carried out in a humane manner."

However, further research since the date of that congressional report pins the blame squarely on England and on the United States along with Russia.

The fruits of this research have been assembled by a French scholar, Alfred Grosser, and were published in January of this year. The publication is called *L'Allemagne de l'Occident, 1945-53*. The publisher is Gallimard in Paris.

Poland was, by Allied agreement in 1944, to be compensated in the West for territory she would yield to Russia in the East. This understanding envisaged the transfer of all non-Polish populations from the new area which was, of course, to be taken away from Germany. These persons to be deported would have no place to go except within what would be left of Germany.

In the final months of 1944, discussions on this subject took place between the Polish Exile Government in London and the British and American Governments. Two confidential letters resulted from the conference.

The first of the two letters was written November 2, 1944, by the British Foreign Office in the name of the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill. It accepted the line of the Oder River, including Stettin, without specifying in detail the southern part. It offered the support and guaranty of Great Britain to Poland

for this boundary, even in case of an unfavorable attitude on the part of the United States.

The second letter was dated November 17, 1944, and was signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States. In this letter, President Roosevelt said he would agree to any boundary approved by Poland, Russia, and Great Britain. He would not raise any objections to a transfer of population and even offered to assist in the expulsions.

The highlights of this letter are contained in annex A.

On December 15, 1944, Churchill spoke to the House of Commons about the advantages Poland would obtain in the West from the German territories far richer than those she was to abandon in the East.

Churchill's painfully clear foresight of the expulsion deed and his admission of complicity are clearly contained in this speech. See annex B.

At Yalta, Churchill repeated, "the 6 or 7 million Germans killed in the war, plus a million more dead that are to be expected to die before the surrender will leave plenty of space in Germany for the deported populations."

It must be said in Mr. Churchill's behalf that he advocated the drawing of the southern part of the new border along the eastern Neisse River while the Russians wanted to draw it along the western Neisse River. This made a potential difference of more than 4 million German citizens to become liable to deportation.

However, the Neisse part of the border was never agreed upon and the Americans learned at Potsdam that by an agreement signed April 21, 1945, the Soviet Union had given to Poland for purposes of administration and expulsion all the territory up to the Oder-western Neisse line.

By the time of Potsdam, Roosevelt was dead, and in the months thereafter both President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill tried to get out from under responsibility for the expulsions. But in view of the record, it seems clear that they had established the principle of expulsion as desirable. After that it must have seemed peculiar to the Russians that they would seem to quibble over 1 or 2 million expellees, more or less.

This bill, including 110,000 special immigration visas for expellees and escapees, will, if only in token fashion, undo a small fraction of this great evil. Let's welcome our conscience quota.

[Annex A to testimony of James Finucane]

#### PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO MR. MIKOLAJCZYK

The following is the text of a message addressed by President F. D. Roosevelt to Mr. Mikolajczyk, who was at that time Prime Minister of the London Polish Government. This message, signed on November 17, 1944, in part 3 deals with the question of the transfer of population.

NOVEMBER 17, 1944.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER:

\* \* \* \* \*

3. If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from territory of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection and as far as practicable will facilitate such transfer.

\* \* \* \* \*

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

[Annex B to testimony of James Finucane]

#### EXTRACT FROM SPEECH MADE BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE WINSTON CHURCHILL PRIME MINISTER OF HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

Mr. Churchill, as Prime Minister of the British Cabinet, in a speech to the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, dealt in detail with the transfer of the German population from Poland.

The relevant extract is given below:

"The transference of several millions of people would have to be effected from the east to the west or north, and the expulsion of the Germans (because that is what is proposed—the total expulsion of the Germans) from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and north. For expulsion is the method which, so

far as we have been able to see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting. There will be no mixture of populations to cause endless trouble as in Alsace-Lorraine. A clean sweep will be made. I am not alarmed at the prospect of the disentanglement of populations, nor am I alarmed by these large transferences, which are more possible than they ever were before through modern conditions \* \* \*.

"Nor do I see why there should not be room in Germany for the German population of East Prussia and of the other territories I have mentioned. After all, 6 million or 7 million Germans have been killed already in this frightful war, into which they did not hesitate, for a second time in a generation, to plunge all Europe. At the present time, we are told that they have 10 million or 12 million prisoners or foreigners used as slaves in Germany, who will, we hope, be restored to their own homes and lands when victory is gained. Moreover, we must expect that many more Germans will be killed in the fighting which will occupy the spring and summer, and which we must expect will involve the largest and fiercest battle yet fought in this war \* \* \*."

**SHARING THE 110,000 POOLED VISAS IN THE PROPOSED BILL FOR 240,000  
EMERGENCY IMMIGRANTS**

*Total refugees, potential emigrants among them, and fair distribution of 110,000  
sec. 4 (a) (1) visas by simple numerical proportion*

[Figures for West Germany, West Berlin and Austria Only]

[Population statistics as of May 1, 1953 (in part estimated)]

Categories of refugees	A	B	C
	Refugee population in West Germany, West Berlin, and Austria	Potential emergency migrants among refugees, i. e., those not firmly settled	Proposed distribution of visas (follows proportions of column B)
Eastern Europe escapees.....	340,000	200,000	5,570
Eastern Germany escapees.....	2,000,000	750,000	20,885
Expellees.....	8,500,000	3,000,000	83,545
Total.....	10,500,000	3,950,000	110,000

Submitted by the National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th St. NW., Washington 6, D. C.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,  
Washington 6, D. C., June 11, 1953.

Congressman LOUIS E. GRAHAM,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, House Committee on the Judiciary,  
House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Here are copies of two letters and a clipping supplementing the testimony that I gave to your committee yesterday morning. I think they may contribute something to the discussion—particularly if inserted in the record of the hearing at the appropriate point.

Thank you and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FINUCANE, Associate Secretary.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,  
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1953.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER,  
House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: I am enclosing the text of the clipping, in German, which gives as "4 to 5 percent" the proportion of persons among current "legalized" refugees who flee from the East Zone "because of danger to life, limb, or liberty." You will note that the "90 percent" figure, which is approximately the one you

used during yesterday's hearing, refers to the "legalized" group as a whole. However, 95 or 96 percent of these "legals" are so recognized on the basis of a flight undertaken for "other compelling reasons," and not because of danger to life, limb, or liberty.

The important thing, in any refugee legislation that is written, it seems to us, is that the definition of refugee or escapee be broad enough to include the entire 90 percent to which you referred in the hearing yesterday morning and not just the most crucially endangered fraction. The language might read something like this (using the committee print as a model):

#### Definitions

(Page 1, line 6)

SEC. 2. When used in this Act the term—

(a) (1) "East Europe Escapee" means any person who, during or after World War II has left the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied area of Europe, and who because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion, or who because of a positive personal option for democracy as a way of life, or for other compelling reasons, refuses to return thereto and who has not been firmly resettled.

(2.) "East Germany Escapee" means any person who, during or after World War II, has left those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and who because of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or who because of a positive personal option for democracy as a way of life, or for other compelling reasons, refuses to return thereto and who has not been firmly resettled.

Best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FINUCANE,  
Associate Secretary.

#### CLIPPING ATTACHED TO LETTER TO MR. CELLER

(The clipping may be summarized as follows:)

[Die Neue Zürcher Zeitung, May 30, 1953]

#### EXPELLEES AND REFUGEES

Ninety percent of the refugees fleeing into West Berlin are "legalized," by West Berlin authorities after their arrival.

This 90 percent consists of persons who fled "because of danger to life, limb, or personal liberty, or because of other compelling reasons."

The "life, limb, or personal liberty" category amounts to 4 or 5 percent of the entire "legalized" group. All the others in the "legalized" group acquire their legal status on the official assumption that they fled because of "other compelling reasons."

Submitted by National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PREVENTION OF WAR,  
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1953.

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER,  
House of Representatives, House Office Building,  
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE WALTER: In line with your question about the 600 unused German quota numbers, I checked with the State Department Consular Report as of August 1, 1952. It is printed at page 104 in Whom We Shall Welcome. It shows as of that date a registration of 262,598 applicants, some of whom certainly should have qualified for the unused 600.

I am at a loss to understand, beyond the suppositions I advanced at the hearing, why these 600 remained unused.

If there is any clear and simple answer known to you I would appreciate learning it.

Best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FINUCANE,  
Associate Secretary.

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. FELIX F. BURANT, PRESIDENT,  
POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE, CHAPLAIN, COLONEL,  
USAR

Monsignor BURANT. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I shall file with you but shall not read it because it is printed and everybody can read it.

The first thing is that I wish to thank you for calling me in here because of my deep interest in this subject. I am a priest and a social worker.

Secondly, I appreciate the work the committee is doing to implement the President's recommendations.

Mr. GRAHAM. At this point, will you now offer your statement for the record?

Monsignor BURANT. I would be glad to.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. MSGR. FELIX F. BURANT, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH  
IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE, CHAPLAIN (COLONEL) USAR BEFORE THE SUB-  
COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, JUNE 10, 1953, REGARD-  
ING EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity offered me to make a few observations on the vital and burning problem of opening the doors of the United States for additional thousands of people who have been made homeless as a consequence of war, Soviet occupation, or other circumstances.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's appeal in defense of these people and a number of legislative bills submitted to Congress seem to give hope that the fate of these people will be sincerely considered during this session of the Congress.

The Polish Immigration Committee is helping countless Polish refugees, displaced persons, escapees, soldiers of the former Polish Army in Exile and regular quota immigrants in their immigration to the United States and resettlement after their arrival. The Committee is also taking care of Polish seamen who left their ships for political reasons and whose immigration status so far has not been adjusted. Any immigration legislation, therefore, is of vital interest to our organization, the Polish quota being very small and under the provision of the Displaced Persons Act mortgaged 50 percent until 1999. Poles applying now for the United States visa have to wait approximately 5 years for their turn.

In his message of April 22, 1953, the President of the United States recommended admission of 240,000 immigrants above quotas to relieve the refugee problem in Western Europe and to ease the problem of overpopulation. We have warmly welcomed this message and I would like to state our wholehearted support of the action undertaken by the President and of the devoted work of the committee which strives to implement the President's wish and extend a helping hand to thousands of brave men who, through no fault of their own, are forced to live the life of exiles.

After analyzing the legislative bills submitted in connection with emergency immigration I would like to add a few remarks which express the opinion of the organization represented by me and which, as resulting from my familiarity with refugee and immigration problems, may contribute to a final formulation of the Commission's viewpoint.

Concerning the definitions used in the various proposed bills we readily subscribe to the definitions used by United States Senator Arthur V. Watkins and Congressman Joseph L. Carrigg, that "refugee" or "escapee" means any person of European origin who as a result of World War II or its aftermath ceased to be a resident of one of the presently Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas, and whose repatriation to the same European country cannot be effected because of fear of persecution, and who has not been firmly resettled.

Our first concern is for the displaced persons still in Germany. The overwhelming majority of them were covered by the Displaced Persons Act but some did not succeed to complete all the necessary formalities before deadline of January 1, 1952. It is our opinion that those who remain in Germany longest should

be given the first consideration irrespective of the number of visas to be allotted to refugees or escapees in Germany and Austria. I cannot speak for all displaced persons in Germany however I must point out that the Polish refugees there are in an extremely difficult situation being at the mercy of the German authorities which are preoccupied with the problem of their own surplus population and are unfortunately, not very friendly disposed to former victims of Nazi oppression.

With regard to refugees in other countries we firmly believe that the number of 15,000 visas proposed in the majority of bills for refugees and escapees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and within Turkey is not adequate and that a greater number should be foreseen in order to cover the existing needs. It should also be pointed out that there seems to be some disproportion between proposed visa allotments to the countries with surplus population and refugees in favor of the overpopulated countries.

At the same time we submit that Sweden should be included in the European countries covered by emergency legislation. Among all Scandinavian countries Sweden has the largest group of political refugees and recent escapees. Because of Sweden's neutrality and geographical proximity to Soviet Russia and some Iron Curtain countries they have reason to be concerned about their safety. The presence of many Soviet agents increases the feeling of insecurity of these political exiles.

We are convinced that any emergency legislation should include a number of Polish soldiers of the former Polish Army in Exile, who for some reason or other were unable to take advantage of the Displaced Persons Act and were left in Great Britain. There are about 140,000 Polish soldiers, including dependents, in Great Britain out of which only 10,300 benefited by the said act. However, quite a number of others, despite their best intentions, were prevented from availing themselves of that opportunity because either they reported too late for registration—the rigidly enforced ultimate date being June 16, 1950, or, though registered, they had not received in time the required assurances, or having all the formalities fulfilled they were not in a position to pay their transportation to the United States—the British Government having withdrawn beginning October 1, 1951, the privilege of free passage granted previously to former Polish soldiers. This somewhat unexpected move of the British Government frustrated plans of many applicants who were not prepared for such a possibility, and since they had no sufficient savings of their own to pay their passage they were deprived of the chance to proceed to the United States. American consulates refused to consider these soldiers under section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act having assumed that they were firmly resettled although such an assumption is not justified since they expressed their will to emigrate by registering themselves and by not applying for British citizenship. We think that all those who registered between June 16, 1951 and December 31, 1951, and those whose cases were processed but for some reason not completed should not be classified as firmly resettled but instead should be listed as political refugees. In any case that group is not a large one—we estimate that the total number will not exceed 4,000 at the utmost and we think that either an additional number of visas should be allotted to these members of the Polish Army in Exile left behind in Great Britain or that the total number of visas for refugees should proportionately be increased.

I would like to submit a point deserving special consideration should be the reuniting of families. In this respect no difference should be made between relatives of United States citizens and legal residents in the United States.

Lastly I would suggest that some provisions be made for the relief of the refugees who are actually residing in the United States but for some reason were unable to adjust their immigration status. We are concerned both with those who arrived here legally and those who arrived illegally seeking political asylum in this country. It is our belief that the same treatment should be allotted to the latter category as that pledged by President Eisenhower to the prisoners of war in Korea who will be offered a chance to live as freemen in a free society.

To illustrate, I would like to recall here the case of Polish sailors who 4 years ago deserted Polish ships at New York as an obvious sign of their protest against the present Communist government in Poland. All of them are steadily employed, they have proved to be of good moral character, some of them married and have children. In spite of all these facts they are still under deportation orders and live in constant fear. Private bills introduced by Members of the Congress in their behalf did not help and they are kept in suspense. I will also mention the case of a young heroic Polish seaman, who in July 1951 organized a mutiny—the first of this kind—on the Polish Navy ship *Zuraw*, and with 5 other sailors

locked all the crew consisting of 6 officers and 32 mates below deck, navigated the ship to Ystad, Sweden, where he surrendered it to Swedish authorities. After a short stay in Sweden where he did not feel safe, he reached this country as a stow-away and after a year his status is not yet legalized. You have probably read about a few cases involving Polish refugees who even after meritorious service in the United States Armed Forces were ordered deported from this country because they had entered this country illegally as political exiles. What, is the logical difference between—John J. Doe—entering West Germany—from East Germany running away from Communists and receiving political protection sanctioned by our High Commissioner and—Stanley Joe Ski—crossing the boundary line of the United States of America by way of ship. The first John Doe is O. K., the second Stanley Joe is considered a felon and facing deportation \* \* \* he must live under pressure for indefinite period of time, when he thought he ran away from enemies to friendly country.

We earnestly hope that the Congress in its present session will enact the vital legislation thus bringing relief to thousands of oppressed and distressed people, in accordance with the best American tradition. It should not be forgotten that every day of waiting weakens the physical and moral resistance of those unfortunate people and therefore a speedy action in this matter is essential.

I cannot accept the view of one of our most esteemed organizations which objects to President Eisenhower's program to admit 240,000 immigrants from Europe, since "it would mean an addition of 1,250 potential spies and saboteurs to our present powder keg situation."

As a priest, social worker and American soldier I may state on the contrary that the new immigrants, like our predecessors, are of great value for the development of our economy. More than that, they are in the forefront of our struggle against world communism and thousands are already wearing our American uniforms. They know even better than ourselves how to cherish freedom because they had been deprived of it.

As far as the 1,250 potential subversives are concerned I am sure that our security agencies will know how to weed them out and that 240,000 will not be deprived of sharing with us the blessings of freedom and our American way of life.

Monsignor BURANT. The next point is that we are grateful for anything that is done. Why? Because the Polish quota is mortgaged up to 1999. Therefore, anything that is done is appreciated by us.

This bill has our wholehearted support. We are a charitable organization. We appear not as lawyer but as a friend.

Mr. WALTER. Monsignor, may I interrupt at that point? In your statement you discuss General Anders and his army. When I was in England last year I was informed that there were 7,000 available visas and these people did not apply for them. Why did they not apply for admission under the Displaced Persons Act?

Monsignor BURANT. In the first place because they failed to register. Time was limited.

Secondly, when they were registered, then the British Government has stopped paying for transportation. That was October 1, 1951, and they could not come because they had no money. And through their own fault, perhaps, for not registering because they had to register before, the date of June 16, 1950; that was the deadline.

Mr. WALTER. 1951?

Monsignor BURANT. 1950. And they failed because knowledge was not disseminated fast enough.

Mr. WALTER. We were informed that there was another reason. Relief and all social reforms and the British law appealed to them.

Monsignor BURANT. They do appeal, yes, but it is a stalemated life. There is no progress because they are limited as to employment.

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no.

Monsignor BURANT. They cannot get every job. They have to be citizens. Unless they are citizens, British subjects—

Mr. WALTER. I think they were made citizens by broad, sweeping law.

Monsignor BURANT. We are speaking only about those who did not accept the citizenship, only those.

Mr. WALTER. What about those Polish refugees who are in the United States? They are not in danger of being deported to Poland. Why cannot their status be adjusted?

Monsignor BURANT. I might as well take that up right now. We have the people who came here: seamen, sailors who jumped ship, and they had a right to be here 29 days. Their coming here was legal but their stay after 29 days was illegal. So they were hard pressed and those people were not taken care of. There is no law which can take care of them right now, especially those who are illegally here. Those are the ones that stowed away. Now let me give you an example.

Mr. WALTER. There are 500,000 people of that sort in the New York metropolitan area as of now.

Monsignor BURANT. I am not speaking of that, Mr. Walter. I am speaking of the Poles who ran away. I am not having in mind the adventurers, not the job seekers, not the ones who want to know what is beyond the hill, or not the ones who have personal reasons to come here and stay here and think they can. I am speaking about people who are known to our organization. I spent 1 full night over in Newark, took by bus 129 of them, and God bless Congresswoman Mary Norton, she put them on a bill.

Mr. WALTER. I thought that provision with respect to the displaced persons in the United States—

Monsignor BURANT. That was a different category. Private bill. That is a different category. I can speak about that category, too; and that has not been used. That category was of the diplomats, engineers, advisers. Section 4 of the DP Act took care of them, God bless them.

And I say, and I hope that your committee will put a similar act for not many, for about 400 or 500, for the sailors for whom there is no help. Perhaps you in your kind heart—I am no preacher—you may see that—to take them over with one sweep; and these people who are not in, I just appeal to you that those people have this against them, only this. Mr. Chairman, they are good. The Polish Immigration Committee is not a police. We ask them to be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration, and all these people are O. K. The only thing that is wrong with them is that they ran away from the Communists.

Mr. WALTER. How long have they been in this country?

Monsignor BURANT. Some of them have been here since 1950; 1949, even. They have been on Ellis Island.

Mr. WALTER. They have all been released from Ellis Island?

Monsignor BURANT. They have been released and some of them have been deported and of course it was a hard thing. Yes; they are released, but under this provision, you will leave the country within 90 days. Gentlemen, where can they go?

Mr. GRAHAM. May I interrupt you? I am just about to leave to see the parliamentarian. I have a list of 560 cases, many of which you are discussing. We are seeking to have this concurrent resolution put through today.

Mr. WALTER. Some of them are on this list.



Monsignor BURANT. Thank you.

Mr. GRAHAM. Miss Thompson will take over.

Monsignor BURANT. Now, I have another case I would like to bring out which is a very hard thing, and it is not their fault. Mr. Walter spoke about it, about the soldiers in England. Here is the case. The case is this: These people were almost in the pipeline but the dead date killed them off. They are continuously writing to us and asking us if there is any way. There is no way; the Polish quota is absolutely limited. If you want to come to the United States, 5 years is the least you can wait.

Mr. CELLER. The quota is mortgaged to 1999.

Monsignor BURANT. It is mortgaged to 1999. Now, what we are interested, not all, there is 140,000 soldiers in England, we are not interested in all of them. They do not want to come. But there is a maximum, I would say, of about 4,000. Now, we are dealing with the combatant organization in England, General Enders' army. We have in this country right now—we had another meeting as Mr. Celler knows, and the work we do in New York—and you have been there and you saw what we do—

Mr. CELLER. You do splendid work and a good, humanitarian job.

Monsignor BURANT. We say to these people, possibly you can find a way to take care of those, those in the pipeline. We do not care about the rest; perhaps they do not want to come. But those who are willing and have letters, those who have been examined and they failed to come. Why? Because they did not have money, they could not pay their fares when the British Government withdrew. They were late in registering.

Now they find and they write to us.

One more question which is perhaps a very touchy one but I am going to be very abrupt, and that is, you limit the bill, the bill limits it to 240,000, to the NATO countries.

Now, my contention, and the contention of our people is this: That Sweden, which is the closest and has more refugees there, Polish, because they are nearer, and yet they are neutral and anybody in Sweden cannot be taken in by this bill.

Now, if there is possibility of getting those people, those refugees, you can set a dateline, refugees in Sweden, and if the dateline would be set, perhaps they would not go there any more. Perhaps they would stay away. They would go to Denmark or any of these NATO countries, that would be perhaps a very good idea, but I bleed for these people because Sweden is near. Sweden is neutral. There are so many agents there that they are afraid for their life and we know it because they come. Our office is open and we just deal with that.

Mr. HILLINGS. Monsignor, how many, roughly, would you say—I know it is hard to estimate and all you could give would be approximate figures—but how many Poles are leaving Poland for the West at the present time? How many are coming into the West? Very many or just a few, a handful?

Monsignor BURANT. Just a handful, very few.

Mr. HILLINGS. Restrictions are so great it is almost impossible to get out?

Monsignor BURANT. They would have to be in Berlin to get out, in order to get a chance, and they keep them away because the Polish people are agricultural. They live on the farms, mostly, and they are far away and in Russia you cannot move without a little piece of paper or something.

And so, to end my statement, I just want to say this: I am a veteran. I am a soldier. You have heard yesterday that we brought in 24,000. I have 1 case alone of 24,000 that was subversive and he was taken care of by, not by me.

Miss THOMPSON. By his own people.

Monsignor BURANT. By the refugees themselves. They say, he spoils our name. And God bless the commissioner at Newark. He took care of him.

Miss THOMPSON. You had a great many Polish people in Denmark and Sweden. I understand they were all transferred to Australia, is that right?

Monsignor BURANT. Not all of them. There are some scattered all over. The greatest number we have is in Sweden. That is where—

Miss THOMPSON. That is where they went from Poland directly, as I understand.

Monsignor BURANT. Mostly they did. Now, being a soldier and a priest and a social worker, and I want to state this, that you may put that in your record, that the immigrants who come here—I should know because I gave them the start—I speak their language, although I am an American, born here, and so was my father and all that but that is beside the point. I help them and I find—

Mr. CELLER. The important thing is that America was born in you, not where you were born.

Monsignor BURANT. I can mention to you some not so fortunate. They are really helping our economy.

Secondly, which is the most important and vital thing to us, they are the forefront of our struggle against world communism. They are. They know better than I or you what liberty means because they have been deprived of it.

If anyone mentions, I am a veteran; I belong to the Legion; but you now say, I am blunt. And I will say this: They are 99 percent honest, hard-working men, emigrant people, and for God's sake, I hope the 99 will not be judged by the 1 percent of possible but not, in my opinion, probable of dubious value.

Miss THOMPSON. Thank you, Monsignor.

We have one more witness. He is Andrew E. Rice.

#### STATEMENT OF ANDREW E. RICE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. RICE. Because of the lateness of the hour, Madam Chairman, I will just cover very briefly these points. I speak not as a technical, qualified witness as the preceding witnesses have been, with experience in the immigration field, but as a citizen and as a veteran who is concerned about this problem.

Obviously, this legislation, proposed legislation, does not have a direct bearing on the welfare of the veterans. But we hold that it does have a direct bearing on the welfare of our country. We hold

that it will strengthen our country because it will renew the faith of thousands of men and women on both sides of the Iron Curtain in the spirit of justice and fair play on which our democratic way of life has been based..

The men and women I speak for—the veterans of the First World War, the Second World War, the Korean conflict—fought for this spirit of justice and fair play while we were in uniform and that is why we speak up now in continued support of these principles. We believe that admitting these refugees will demonstrate our sincerity in our effort to halt the march of Communist aggression. Most of those now living in Western Europe have fled the tyranny of the Soviets and their satellites.

Mr. HILLINGS. Could I interrupt at this point? How many members does this AVC have?

Mr. RICE. We have about 12,000 members.

Mr. HILLINGS. At one time the AVC was under serious question because of possible Communist domination of its leadership, wasn't it?

Mr. RICE. In 1947-48, Communists, Communist elements, tried to infiltrate. They did infiltrate and tried to take over. We were successful in overcoming those attempts completely. We bar Communists, Fascists, and all totalitarians from our membership and we are given a clean bill of health. In fact, the Federal Bureau of Investigation frequently consults our files and notes those who dropped out about that time as being possibly suspicious, while those of us who stayed with the group are considered; this is one factor in consideration of our loyalty.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is a member of the Communist front eligible for membership in the AVC?

Mr. RICE. There is nothing in our bylaws that says a member of a Communist front is ineligible but we require him to subscribe to the principles of our constitution which are in support of democracy and against communism, and we have ousted a number of people whom we felt have not lived up to that preamble. I am sure you recognize it is impossible, Mr. Hillings, to make a complete investigation of every member, to find out if he does or ever did belong.

Miss THOMPSON. Do they take an oath of some kind?

Mr. RICE. They pledge allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. They subscribe in writing to the principles of democracy which our organization supports.

Mr. HILLINGS. That is all.

Mr. RICE. Since its earliest days America has been a haven for the victims of totalitarianism. The men who serve today in our Armed Forces, many of them, are the sons and grandsons of those who sought America's shores as a true land of liberty. These men and their love of America are among our strongest assets as we face the menace of the Soviet dictatorship.

Therefore, we urge the subcommittee to report favorably on the President's refugee admission program

Miss THOMPSON. Have you finished?

Mr. RICE. Yes.

Are there any questions?

Miss THOMPSON. Mr. Hillings? Mr. Celler?

I think that closes the hearings for this morning. The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

(The document furnished for inclusion in the record is as follows:)

**STATEMENT OF ANDREW E. RICE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO ADMIT 240,000 NONQUOTA REFUGEES**

I am Andrew E. Rice, executive director of the American Veterans Committee (AVC). I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee to speak as a veteran, and on behalf of veterans, in support of the emergency legislation now being considered to admit 240,000 nonquota aliens to the United States over the next 2 years.

Obviously, this legislation does not have a direct bearing on the welfare of veterans in the United States. But it does have a direct bearing on the welfare of our country. It will strengthen it, because it will renew the faith of thousands of men and women, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in the spirit of justice and fair play on which our democratic way of life has always been based. The men and women I speak for fought for the spirit of justice and fair play while we were in uniform; that is why we speak up now in continued support of those principles.

Admitting these refugees will demonstrate our sincerity in our efforts to halt the march of aggressive communism. Many of those now living in desperate conditions in Western Europe have fled the tyranny of the Soviet Union and its satellites; they have shown their love of liberty. Yet they cannot find, in the overpopulated countries of free Europe, the opportunities they need to make their fullest contribution to the strengthening of the forces of democracy.

Since its earliest days, America has been a haven for the victims of totalitarianism. The men who serve today in our Armed Forces, many of them, are the sons and grandsons of those who sought America's shores as a true "land of liberty." These men and their love of America are among our strongest assets as we face the menace of the Soviet dictatorship.

May I say one word about the imagined threat to our national security which at least one other spokesman for a veterans group has predicted in the form of "spies and saboteurs" who might slip into the United States under this legislation. It seems to the American Veterans Committee that this is a back-door attack on the loyalty and ability of the immigration authorities whose business it must be to screen all potential immigrants to ascertain their eligibility to come in. We have confidence in these men, who are doing an important and vital job. The dangers of espionage and subversion are always with us, even if we closed our door to every single alien. But it is not always that there is an opportunity for the United States to strike so significant a blow in support of freedom as the pending legislation provided. The voice of America will never speak louder than when we admit, in justice and compassion, the men and women who await our action.

We urge the subcommittee to report favorably on the President's refugee admission program.

## EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION SERVICE

---

THURSDAY, JULY 9, 1953

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1 OF  
THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 9:54 a. m., the Honorable Louis E. Graham presiding. Present: Miss Thompson, Mr. Celler, Mr. Walter, and Mr. Hillings. Also present: Mr. Walter M. Besterman, legislative assistant.

Mr. GRAHAM. The committee will come to order. We will first hear from our colleague, Mr. Judd.

### STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER H. JUDD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to come before the committee. I am in favor of this bill, as far as it goes. I am in favor of America issuing "special quota immigrant visas to certain escapees, German expellees and nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands." I think that the United States should and will do its rightful share in taking care of these unfortunate individuals. I do not think we ought to fool ourselves into believing this is an adequate way to deal with population pressures. I do think that this is a one-shot measure, if one may put it that way, to deal with certain present emergencies in certain countries.

My primary concern is with regard to what I consider undesirable and unfair discrimination and limitations in the bill.

It purports to be taking care of expellees and refugees, but it is ignoring the largest and the neediest groups of those individuals in the world, the Arabs in refugee camps in the Near East and the refugees from Communist China. It purports to be without discrimination, yet it ignores those who constitute half of the population of the world—the yellow and brown peoples.

The President's letter of April 22, 1953, said:

We are all aware of the tragic developments of the past several years, which have left countless thousands of individuals homeless refugees in the heart of Europe.

Why limit it to Europe? There are plenty of homeless refugees in other parts of the world.

Again the letter says:

In recent months the number of refugees has been increased by the steady flow of escapees who have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain.

Don't escapees in Asia count? More have braved death to escape from behind what was called the bamboo curtain in China and Korea, but which is now an Iron Curtain.

The letter says:

In addition, the problem of population pressures continues to be a source of urgent concern in several friendly countries in Europe.

Again, I ask, Why "in Europe"? For if the bill is to deal with population pressures, they are more acute in parts of Asia than in Europe.

It is on the basis of such considerations that I come before the committee, not to oppose passage of the bill, but to urge changes that will make it more equitable and more beneficial.

There are two main reasons given for this bill, as I understand it: Namely, human sympathy and concern for the well-being and security of the United States. But it does not satisfy either. First, it takes no note of the two largest and neediest groups of refugees, the Arab refugees in the Middle East, and those cooped up in Hong Kong and a few other areas, who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain in China. From the standpoint of human sympathy, it certainly ought to contain some provision for those who are in most dire need.

Second, from the standpoint of the security of the United States and its well-being, it ignores two explosive situations in Asia and makes no provision to help with them at all.

Asia is the place where we are at the greatest disadvantage today. It is the place where we are the weakest. It is the place where we have sustained greatest losses in respect and prestige.

Mr. HILLINGS. Where outside of Hong Kong and Formosa would most of the refugees from Communist China be located?

Mr. JUDD. Some have gotten into the Chinese communities in southeast Asia. There are 11 million people of Chinese ancestry, who live in Malaya, Siam, the Philippine Islands, Indochina, Indonesia, and Burma, and some in India.

Mr. HILLINGS. Are there any at all in Japan?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. There has long been a group of Chinese in Japan, about 50,000, I believe. They have adjusted themselves. They have work to do. They, in a sense, can be considered immigrants to Japan. They are not a major problem. Many were there carrying on trade between China and Japan even before the last war, and have stayed there.

Mr. WALTER. And beyond all that, are you not fearful that if legislation of this sort is enacted, for the purpose stated, it will cause the people who are ignored, the largest class, to take offense, and would it not have the same effect in the Far East as did the exclusion laws we enacted back in 1917 and 1924?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that is my point. This law, as I said to the Senate Committee, from the standpoint of its effect upon Asia, could not have been more advantageous to the Kremlin and disadvantageous to ourselves if it had been written in the Kremlin. What the bill in its present form demonstrates is just what the Kremlin has been telling the Asians all these years, that the western nations do not care anything except for white people. They are imperialists. They have always exploited people of other colors, and this proves it. If you are white, you can get into the club, but if you are not white, you are ineligible. If you cannot get into the western club, there is

only one other club, and that is the one that Joe Stalin was the head of. So why not join without further delay?

We cannot hope, of course, to solve all these problems in any one piece of legislation. My point is that we ought not to pass legislation in a form that does ourselves harm, and this legislation in its present form does positive harm to the United States. It can be portrayed to the enslaved and threatened peoples of Asia as abandoning them. It comes right at a time when the representatives of the three big western powers were supposed to meet at Bermuda. They cannot meet there. They are coming here to Washington, which only points up and focuses attention on the fact that representatives of two European countries hated worse than anyone else east of the Suez are coming to the United States to divide up the rest of the world.

Mr. CELLER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WALTER. After all, this is just a gesture.

Mr. JUDD. The main thing is not the number admitted; it is the equality of status.

Mr. WALTER. This is a very important thing. I would like to hear the experts on this.

Mr. JUDD. I am not against the objective of this bill. But, in its present form, I would be against it, and I would have to oppose it on the floor, because it would do more harm than good to our country, and in the long run, to the peoples of the world whom we desire to help. For it would strengthen our enemies and make war that much more probable.

Mr. CELLER. I thought that you said you were in favor of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Not in its present form. I approve of its objective, what it purports to be but is not.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think that we should combine the refugee and the surplus-population proposition?

Mr. JUDD. No. I do not think that we should fool ourselves that this deals responsibly with surplus populations.

Mr. WALTER. What justification is there for the largest single group, the Italians? What justification is there for them?

Mr. JUDD. The only justification I can see for the Italian group is if it takes care of the so-called returnees.

Mr. WALTER. This is much broader than that. What justification is there for the Dutch or the Greeks?

Mr. JUDD. The Greeks are supposed to have a good many refugees and returnees that have come back from Turkey, and so forth—and Dutch from Indonesia.

Mr. HILLINGS. How many Chinese would you advocate that we take in?

Mr. JUDD. I am not sticking for a particular figure; somewhere between one and five thousand as an assurance or demonstration that this is an act on the part of America to help people who are standing for human freedom against tyranny.

Mr. HILLINGS. Do you have any ideas concerning the screening of these individuals, the refugees from the Asian end of the Iron Curtain?

Mr. JUDD. No. The fact that they are in Hong Kong means that they have been pretty well screened. The British are aware of the security problem, and the Chinese Government has officials in Hong Kong to check on these people. There must be some Commu-

nist agents among them; there are Communist agents everywhere. But I do not think the problem of screening is insuperable. Of course, most of the refugees there could not qualify under our regular requirements, in existing law. It is not the largeness of the number that is the important thing; it is the principle of treating these Asian refugees on the same basis of importance as human beings, as we treat those of Europe with a differently colored skin. That is the thing that is important.

Mr. HILLINGS. As I understand it, you are opposed to the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. HILLINGS. You disagree with the President's recommendation that we should have this provision of the bill to take care of the excess population?

Mr. JUDD. I would not allow that to be a determining factor in my own mind. I have not studied that to the extent you on the committee have, but I merely say that a one-shot special measure for a quarter of a million immigrants does not do much about serious population pressures.

Mr. HILLINGS. You do apparently disagree with the President's position where he advocates that.

Mr. JUDD. To the extent that this is supposed to help relieve population pressure, I think it is not an effective measure.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will you submit for the record your statement before the Senate committee?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; the portions of it that do not repeat what I have said here this morning.

(The statement requested is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER H. JUDD, WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1953, UNITED STATES SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Representative JUDD. My name is Walter H. Judd. I am a Member of Congress from the Fifth District of Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege of appearing before you with respect to S. 1917.

Let me say at the outset that I, of course, approve the stated purpose of this bill, but I regret the limitations of the bill which provide that special-quota immigrant visas are to be issued only to "certain escapees, German expellees, nationals of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands." Because, if the bill purports to be taking care of escapees from Communist tyranny, it is ignoring the largest and neediest group in the whole world, who come under this qualification.

Second, the bill purports to be without discrimination as to race, religion, or national origin; yet, if it were to become law in its present form, it would be the worst act of racial discrimination and exclusion in our immigration laws since the disastrous 1924 so-called Exclusion Act, which also ignored one-half of the people in the world, all those of the yellow and the brown races.

\* \* \* \* \*

Well, there is an Iron Curtain in Asia, too, except that it was called the Bamboo Curtain for a time; and there is a larger number of people who have braved death to escape from behind that curtain of tyranny in China than there is of such escapees in Europe.

Then it says:

"In addition, the problem of population pressures continues to be a source of urgent concern in several friendly countries in Europe."

I must ask again: why "in Europe"? Because if we are going to deal with population pressures in friendly countries, the population pressures are much more acute in other areas of the world than they are in Europe, or at least as acute as in any spot in Europe.



Now, it is concern for such considerations that makes me come before the committee this morning, not to oppose the passage of this bill but to urge its modification, so that it will be genuinely what it purports to be.

There are two proper motives, I am sure, behind this bill. One is human sympathy, and the other is concern for the security and the well-being of the United States.

On either count, it seems to me, it should include some provision for the people to whom I have referred, escapees from Communist tyranny in China and refugees in the Arab camps in the Middle East; because, from the standpoint of human need, they are in much more dire straits than are these folks who would be taken care of from Western Europe.

And, from the standpoint of the security of the United States, to exclude them will, in my judgment, do irreparable damage to the well-being and security of the United States in those areas where it has already been damaged most, in those areas where we are weakest, in those areas where we are already at the greatest disadvantage, and where, to put it bluntly, we have been taking a licking.

\* \* \* \* \*

In 1928, the Kremlin, at its Sixth World Congress, in Moscow, made a basic decision to abandon, for the moment at least, the basic thesis of Karl Marx that the Communist revolution was inevitable in the industrialized countries. They were not making any headway in the industrialized countries. And so they adopted, at the 1928 congress, what is called Theses on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and Semicolonies. That became their modification of Marxian theory and strategy, at least a modified tactic, whereby they kept our attention focused on Europe while they concentrated their efforts on Asia. Up until that time they had not had, and to this day have not had, too great success in Europe, but their success in Asia has been nothing short of phenomenal and, I use the word carefully, terrifying.

Senator WATKINS. I think you know, Congressman, I share many of your views on where the important contest is taking place. In fact, I argued back in the days of the North Atlantic Pact that I was very much alarmed over that situation, because they were concentrating all their energies on Europe, under the idea and the theory that the Communist blueprint meant an invasion and a strike in Europe, ignoring the back door, so called, of the United States.

Representative JUDD. The Communists did not give up on "target Europe," but they decided the better way to get to that target was to move across Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, and cut Europe off from its materials and markets.

Senator WATKINS. And thereby take in hundreds of millions of people to use for cannon fodder.

Representative JUDD. That is right. And look at their success. My position, sir, is that we ought to try to be in the general neighborhood of being as intelligent and wise and skillful in our handling of our affairs as the Communists have been in handling theirs. If they see that the way to get ahead is to work among the non-Caucasian races, why can we not see it is just as essential to our security to do likewise. If we cannot yet do positive things in Asia, we should at least not slap them in the face by passing bills that limit our concern only to those of the same color as we are.

Senator WATKINS. May I say in connection with this that, if you will note, it is designated as an emergency act.

Representative JUDD. That is true. And the emergency is greater in Hong Kong and among the Arab refugees than it is in any of these countries in Europe.

Senator WATKINS. The President had in mind, I think, this situation: that you cannot always move on all fronts at the same time. Now, our immigration policy, our permanent policy, was fixed in the 1952 act.

Representative JUDD. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. And this is one of the emergency type. I think it should be made clear, as far as I am concerned, personally, and I think on the part of my cosponsors, that we have no idea of trying to make it a slap in the face of the Asiatics or trying to make it in any way an exclusion of them, because it is an emergency on a front that the President seemed to feel we ought to move on and take some definite action. Now, whether or not it is the wise thing to include the others is, of course, one of the problems we will have to decide in the committee. I welcome your suggestions. We had a witness yesterday who made the same sort of suggestion you are now making, and I feel it is worthy of consideration by the committee, and I assure you it will be considered in the final draft of whatever legislation comes out.

May I say this particular legislation is an attempt to meet the President's request, and it is in direct response to his letter. If he had indicated that the emergency was as bad over in Asia as he had indicated it is in Europe, the probabilities are that it might have been drawn to take that in. But perhaps we ought not to take in the whole waterfront in one step.

Mr. ARENS. Are you conversant with S. 1766, sponsored by the Senator from Utah?

Representative JUDD. I have not studied that as carefully as I have this bill sir. I have noted summaries of its basic purposes and provisions.

Mr. ARENS. Although it does not purport to be an immigration bill, it would establish an office which would have a concern in addition to the Central European refugees, one which would extend to your refugees in the Far East as well as in the Middle East.

Representative JUDD. I support wholeheartedly that concept. Because this is one of the most ticklish problems in the whole world. And we can move with the best of intentions and still make the most incredible blunders. We need a worldwide approach.

In reply to what you said, Senator, about not taking in the whole waterfront, I agree that we cannot solve the whole immigration and population pressure problems of the world in any one piece of legislation. But we ought not to pass legislation which does us positive harm. And I will say this flatly, that for the Congress of the United States to pick this moment to pass this legislation in its present form is to do just as much good to the enemies of everything you and I believe in as if it had been written in the Kremlin itself. Because it says to a billion people in Asia, "These Americans do not care about you. All they care about is white men. You are the wrong color. You cannot get into the white man's club." And what other club is there? The only other club is the one run from the Kremlin.

Senator WATKINS. We removed the bars in principle, however, in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952.

Mr. ARENS. The record should reflect that those provisions are basically Congressman Judd's bill.

Representative JUDD. All the provisions of my bill to remove racial discrimination were incorporated in that, yes.

Senator WATKINS. I congratulate you on that step.

While you are here, let us talk practicalities. How many people do you think we should admit, under the thesis you now have? How many should we take into consideration? How many can we absorb without doing us damage in the Asiatic countries?

Representative JUDD. I think the number of people in these two groups, the Arab refugees and the Chinese refugees or escapees, who will qualify individually under our laws, our rather strict requirements for immigrants, would not be too great. And as I understand, S. 1917 does not waive for any applicant, the basic qualifications which every immigrant to the United States must have.

Senator WATKINS. Right.

Representative JUDD. And I think that is proper. My guess is that if you went through with a fine-tooth comb, you could not find too many qualified persons in either of these groups.

Mr. ARENS. You have three groups, your Chinese, your Arabs, and your whites in China.

Representative JUDD. Yes; the latter is a relatively small group. I was speaking primarily here of the non-Caucasians. Of course, the Arabs are not strictly non-Caucasians; but the Arab refugees are Asians, rather than European peoples, and so are excluded, actually, in the very definitions and limitations in the bill. You referred, Mr. Arens, to the Russians, or the people in China of the Caucasian race, who are descendants of white Russians who fled from Russia at the time of the Red revolution in 1917. There were also in China for a time a good many Europeans, several thousand, who had gone to China in the late thirties as refugees from Hitler's persecutions in Germany and Austria, and the United Nations Refugee Commission went out and helped in getting a lot of those folks out.

That is one of the things that emphasizes the discrimination. The people of Asia see representatives of the United Nations spending money to save a little handful of people of the Caucasian race who are refugees, and just passing by without 1 cent for those of the non-Caucasian races.

Mr. ARENS. What are your statistics, Congressman, first of all on your Hong Kong Chinese?

Representative JUDD. There are over a million and a quarter refugees and escapees from Communist China in Hong Kong. The population was only about 800,000 at the end of the war, and now it is two and a quarter million.

Mr. ARENS. Now, I understand from private conversation with you the other day at this dinner that you are identified with a group that have been moving some of these people to Formosa. I think it would be very helpful to the committee if you would be good enough to give the committee a word about your organization and how it is financed.

Representative JUDD. Well, there are in this group of refugees in Hong Kong some individuals whom I have known in the past, both when I was out in China and when they were students in our country. I tried to get several foundations interested, and I tried to get our Government interested, and I tried to get the International Refugee Commission and various other groups interested, and nobody would pay any attention to it. Finally, in order to be able to sleep nights, I started out with 3 or 4 other people who felt the same way, and we organized a committee called "Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals Inc." I sent out a letter the first of December 1951, to a group of several hundred people to see whether there was any interest, whether there was any response, whether the American people cared. And the response was far better than I expected. So I said, "It is clear that our people are aware of this problem. They are interested. They do not know what to do or how."

So, in addition to my other work, which I sometimes had to neglect, I have given a lot of my time for the last year and a half to the development of this organization, Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc. It has a very distinguished Board of directors, and it has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life to see the number of high grade people in our country, busy as anybody could be, who have given of their money and time, have gone to meetings, and have written letters and raised money to help these refugees.

Mr. ARENS. What do you do, Congressman?

Representative JUDD. First, we had to find out what the situation was. Obviously, we could not go into general relief. A private agency cannot handle a million and a quarter refugees. So inasmuch as my primary interest had been challenged by those who are what we would call intellectuals, that is, graduates of American universities and Chinese universities, and so forth, we set up an office in Hong Kong, and as quietly as we could, sent around a questionnaire and made a census. We have in our files the filled-out questionnaires of 27,000 people, who have what can be called a college education, or the equivalent thereof.

Now, among them, more than 2,000 have degrees from American colleges. Some of them have 3 or 4 degrees. There are doctors of jurisprudence and education. There are 10 or 12 Ph. D.'s from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. There are engineers, physicians, scientists, scholars, physicists. One was a top nuclear physicist whom the Communists were trying their best to get back into China, and he wouldn't go.

These people were in despair, even greater spiritual despair than physical need. Most of them originally had some resources, or they could not even have made this bold venture out from behind the Iron Curtain. But they have eaten up those resources. They have lived off their relatives. And the fact that the free world which called them to resist Communist tyranny and be true to their principles now allowed them to starve and to rot professionally and to deteriorate spiritually, was heartbreaking.

Mr. ARENS. All of them were geographically located in Hong Kong?

Representative JUDD. We have not touched anybody except in Hong Kong. The great bulk is there.

We have 3 or 4 projects for them. The big one is to resettle them. Hong Kong itself is no secure position. We have tried to get them into various places, Brazil or down into some of the relatively unoccupied parts of southeast Asia, Timor, and some of those East Indian islands. But the best and easiest place to relocate them is in Formosa.

We had difficulty in the beginning. The people on Formosa did not have enough food and shelter for themselves. They did not want to take any more people in. The natives of Formosa were particularly resentful about more Chinese "mainlanders," as they called them, coming in.

Then there was the problem of security. At that time there was a lot of Communist infiltration, and the Chinese Government on Formosa was understandably afraid there would be more infiltration.

In the last year and a quarter, we have raised a quarter of a million dollars and we have now relocated, as of the 30th of April, almost 250 families. That is an average of a man and his wife and two children.

Mr. ARENS. Any government aid at all of any consequence?

Representative JUDD. No. We have just raised it ourselves. I got \$25,000 from each of three foundations to help us in the beginning, and the rest has been raised a little here and a little there. But in the new Mutual Security bill before Congress there is a provision for several million dollars for refugees, and I think we will be able to get some of that. The new authorization bill is before my Committee on Foreign Affairs now, and then there will have to be appropriations.

But it just seemed to us incredible to ignore these needy people. For they are persons who—(1) Know ancient China and her culture. (2) They are trained in our Western universities, and they believe in the West. They would not be refugees if they did not believe in the West and our ideas of freedom. And (3) they know communism. They are in a better position to produce literature, to tell the story of the conflict of ideas and arms in that crucial part of the world than anyone else. They can be the leaven that can go back into China if and when she is liberated, and rebuild the institutions and ideas that they, like we, think are necessary for a good world. Without them it cannot be done, even if the Communists were overthrown tomorrow.

Mr. ARENS. Just to probe your thinking, Congressman, as you know under the Judd bill, which is incorporated in the Immigration and Nationality Act, your Asiatic countries, all of them, have minimum quotas, plus your Asiatic-Pacific triangle, your minimum quota of a hundred.

In order that there would not be a disproportionate number of Asiatics in any contemplated bill, to the number of Asiatics in the United States, what would you think of a suggestion that popped into my mind just now, of a ratio in the countries which have refugees of so many times their quota? You see, if you start with 240,000 and undertake to give say, 240,000 to the Asian countries, you just have more people coming into this country of Asian ancestry than can be assimilated, because of the Asians here.

Representative JUDD. That is right. There are not enough people here of their own background to associate with them and to guide them and assist them.

Mr. ARENS. So my thought, then, went to the question of what formula could be worked out which would be fair and equitable on that whole theory. And if you take, say, 10 times the quota of the country in which there is a refugee, you would have 10 times 100 for China, which would be 1,000, and 10 times the quota for Italy. What is Italy's quota? Around 6,000? That would give your 60,000. You see, you could have a ratio worked that way. What do you think of that, just off the cuff, Congressman?

Representative JUDD. I wondered myself when I read this bill, where the figures of 75,000 for Italy, 20,000 for Greece, 20,000 for Netherlands, and so forth, came from, whether there was some formula behind it.

I could not detect any.

Mr. ARENS. Apparently not.

Senator WATKINS. There was no formula, as I understand it. It was based on the political necessity in waging the cold war, largely.

Representative JUDD. On that kind of basis, I am sure there has got to be some inclusion. Actually, a few thousand—

Mr. ARENS. Ten times a hundred for China would be a thousand. That would be a fair ratio, would it not?

Representative JUDD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. So that you could convince the people of the Far East that we are not discriminating against them.

Representative JUDD. That is exactly what I mean. I am not sticking to a particular number here, or a percentage. And I did not in the original Judd bill. The objective was equality of status, not equality of numbers; so that there would be no stigma attached to them that they are unworthy because of their race. Because that is just dynamite against our cause.

Mr. ARENS. I notice your comment with respect to the Arabs. I have made a considerable study, to be quite frank, of the Arab situation, along with the situation in these other areas of the world, because of our interest in the refugee problem. Basically, I think the Arab governments do not want their people to immigrate. What would be your reaction there?

Representative JUDD. That is probably true. Naturally, we are not going to inveigle or urge any to come if they do not want to come. But I think that there has to be opportunity for some qualified individuals from these groups, to get into the United States if they so desire, if we are to have intelligent concern for the political necessities of the cold war.

I came over here today without a definite proposal, because I have not studied it as thoroughly as you on the committee. But I am sure, sir, some provision can be worked out by you and your experts on the committee staff that will give recognition and some equality of treatment to these individuals who, if we mean anything at all by what we say, are equal human beings in the sight of God and in the concern of our people.

Mr. ARENS. Could you give us one word now, Mr. Congressman, if you please, on the number of whites? I understand there are some White Russians still left in Hong Kong, relatively few. There was a man who attended this dinner over here the other day that talked about that.

Representative JUDD. Yes. It seems to me he said the total, counting in Tientsin, Peking, Shanghai, Manchuria, and so on, is something like 15,000.

Mr. ARENS. And I believe you said about 6,000 of them had already worked out some kind of arrangement to go to South America.

Representative JUDD. That is right.

Mr. ARENS. So there would be about 9,000 left.

Representative JUDD. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any accurate statistical information on those people?

Representative JUDD. No, I have not. The speaker seemed to have, and he is a very reliable person from everything I have ever heard. But I do have accurate information on the group of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. Actually, to be complete in my statement, our committee's concern was not to get those Chinese leaders into the United States. Our concern was to preserve them so that when the day comes that China is free they can go back into their own country. They are needed more in their own country. If there is some place where they can go during this period and be preserved and do useful work, that would be what would be most desirable.

Mr. ARENS. What about Chiang Kai-shek taking them into Formosa in more numbers than you have been able to get over there?

Representative JUDD. We are moving about as rapidly as he can or as we can with a small private agency. These refugees have got to be cleared individually. Most of them do not have any papers, you see. They are in Hong Kong, which does not recognize the Nationalist Government. They are refugees from the Chinese Communists. So, they have no Nationalist papers. They have no Communist papers. It is a terrific job of screening, and our organization has to render this service of trying to get their papers straightened out.

Then we have to get specific jobs lined up for them. The Formosans do not want to take them in to be just refugees there. They want them only when we have lined up a job for a schoolteacher or a doctor, or a job for an agriculturalist, or a Chinese who can serve as an interpreter with our Armed Forces over there, because he knows English very well. We send these men and their families over to Formosa only when they can go to almost pinpointed jobs. The problem of securing the openings for them in Formosa is one of our major problems.

We hope this year to move 1,000 families. I think we are going to make it. But this law must also give recognition to these people by permitting some of them to come to the United States.

Mr. ARENS. Is this appropriation you were talking about a minute ago, Congressman Judd, that is contemplated by the substantive law before the Appropriation Committee, such that it sets up any kind of agency to give relief to the Chinese?

Representative JUDD. No. I think it would use, with careful supervision, this agency, aid refugee Chinese intellectuals, as far as resettlement is concerned.

Mr. ARENS. To whom was the money contemplated?

Representative JUDD. It goes to Mutual Security Administration. That law has in it a provision that the lawyers say is adequate to permit handling these as a part of our own defense necessities in that part of the world. There is also debate as to whether they can perhaps be handled under the Kersten amendment.

Mr. ARENS. The Kersten amendment would only be for Europe, would it not?

Representative JUDD. Yes, but it may be modified to include them.

Mr. ARENS. Now, let me ask you this. Do you have information just in résumé form on the Korean refugees?

Representative JUDD. No, I have not studied that carefully. I think that those refugees, if we can get a peace that reunites their country and gives them security, prefer to stay where they are. And I should think the thing to do would be to take care of them where they are, until such time as there is some definitive settlement one way or the other which lets us know whether there is hope for that country, or nothing but despair for them.

Mr. ARENS. Why is it that the United Nations is operating in Korea, there, spending considerable money, and it is not doing anything for your Chinese refugees in Hong Kong? Is there any political reason? I mean, "political" in the broadest possible sense.

Representative JUDD. Well, I would rather not discuss that here. In Hong Kong we have to deal with the British Government which is, to put it this way, anxious to provoke nobody. We have to deal with the Chinese Nationalist Government. We have to deal with the American Government, because we are an American corporation. And we have to deal with these refugees who have relatives at home in Communist China, and who are, some of them, about to the point where they would just as soon commit suicide as go back behind the Iron Curtain. Therefore, I would rather not make comments on the overall political situation in that part of the world. I do not want to stir up animus. We are a nonpolitical organization.

Mr. ARENS. However, if some legislation were to be evolved which would undertake even to do a token something for these Chinese refugees, the Government here would be confronted with the issue as to whether or not there is a political problem in trying to do something for the refugees there.

Representative JUDD. Yes. But, on the basis of a year and a half of experience, I am convinced there would be no obstacle placed in our way there by the British Government. These folks are a terrific burden on Hong Kong. They would be glad to get them out of there. You can be sure of that. So I do not think you would find difficulties, obstacles, put in the way.

Mr. ARENS. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Representative JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge that the committee make some provision, a few thousand or something of the sort, for qualified refugees in other areas than just Europe. Because, I repeat, to pass it in its present form can only give substance to the Communist charges all through Asia, which have been so successful in winning people away from our side in the cold war. It cannot but give substance to their charge that the United States is interested only in white people, and that the billion people who live in Asia, half the people of the world, the ones who are tipping the scale against us in the cold war, are of no concern to us. And for us to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in the cold war, for us to have lost 24,000 American lives in Korea to try to prevent Communist conquest there, and then help give the whole area away by an act which makes no recognition of the importance of individuals of other races than our own, seems to me poor economy and bad security and a forgetting of all the principles we say we are fighting for.

Thank you very much.

Senator WATKINS. Doctor, you have given us some idea about the number involved. As I said before, I think the committee will probably look with sympathetic consideration on your suggestions here.

Representative JUDD. I would say 5,000 or 10,000 or something like that of these carefully screened, qualified individuals.

Senator WATKINS. And you would have them submitted to the same kind of a screening as required under the 1952 act?

Representative JUDD. Certainly. And that is why, although there are a million and a quarter refugees, when you screen that way, the great bulk could not qualify under our immigration laws.

Mr. ARENS. Do you have any comment to make on any screening which your private agents have been able to do from the standpoint of screening out subversives?

Representative JUDD. We have been very careful on that, and of course before the Chinese Government will take them, it has to screen them with its own secret service.

Mr. ARENS. Do they have the facilities for that over there?

Representative JUDD. Well, yes. There are Chinese agencies in Hong Kong. The British cooperate on that. They allow these Chinese Government agencies, even though they do not recognize the Chinese Government, to be there and interview these persons and investigate their family connections and go back into their papers. Because, naturally, the Chinese Government is not going to allow Chinese refugees to come in who will be Communist agents. Every family that we resettle in Formosa has got to be cleared, of course, by the Chinese Government.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, I have one question.

Senator WATKINS. Go ahead.

Senator WELKER. I, as usual, came late, and I missed one portion of your statement. With respect to the Chinese intellectuals, will that cause any ill will, when you single them out, as between the intellectual bracket and the hard-working laboring class of refugees?

Representative JUDD. No. It will cause much less in China than in any other country in the world, because the Chinese since Confucius' day, at least, have had a respect for the scholar that I think is not equaled any place else in the world. They, themselves, have always put up in the top bracket the scholar. And their greatest aspiration is for themselves and their children to become scholars. For these mature Chinese scholars who have been educated abroad to have this privilege of being saved for useful work is something that the Chinese working people and the other refugees will cheer, even though they themselves are left out, because they are so devoted to this concept of preserving their basic culture and literature and philosophy. They are exceedingly proud of it, even the illiterate ones. They are proud of the Chinese scholarship, and they want to preserve it.

I sometimes think of how we spend millions of dollars every year in some ruins in Ur or Egypt or Asia Minor, trying to find out something about a culture that has gone. The Chinese culture is one of the greatest cultures in all of history. It has the longest continuous history. It is magnificent in many respects. And it is being destroyed right before our eyes, and we do not lift a finger to prevent it, so that 4,000 years from now somebody may be digging among the ruins to try to find out what art, what poetry, what philosophies existed in this ancient culture. The Communists know they have got to destroy this culture, this way of life, this way of thinking, or it will eventually absorb them. So they are out to destroy the books and destroy the scholars and eliminate the ideas from people's minds.

Senator WATKINS. Doctor, do you not concede that the United States is now spending a good many billions of dollars over in Asia to try to eventually free the Chinese people? I thought you said we were not making any kind of a contribution. We are making about all the contribution we can make.

Representative JUDD. If I said that, I misspoke myself. We are not making a contribution with respect to the refugees. No one is more aware than I of the enormous contribution that we are making along military and economic lines, but, in my judgment, it will not be successful if we insult the people and exclude them because of their race in this refugee-escapee matter.

Senator WELKER. You have been a visitor to my State many times, and, as you know, we certainly have a field not only in my State but in the Northwest, there, where we could use thousands of laborers to help us in our farming operations. The only avenue we now have is the immigrant labor from Mexico and the so-called wetbacks. And the question that arose in my mind was whether, if we were to bring in from China immigrant labor of that kind, the effect would be such as to cause dissension in China.

Representative JUDD. I did not understand your question that way. I thought you meant whether taking only those who would meet these qualifications would cause this reaction among the others. I do not think it would cause bitterness on the part of those who were excluded because of their failure to meet the qualifications. If it is on a basis of qualifications, I do not think there would be any resentment.

On the other hand, when you are looking, as I see on page 10 of the bill, for farm workers, the Chinese are as good farmers as ever existed in the world, willing to do the kind of thing that, as we well know, our own people do not like to do any more.

Senator WATKINS. And for the most part will not do.

Representative JUDD. That is right. So that I think consideration could well be given to the bringing in of some of these refugees of this type, if they can qualify under the immigration laws.

Senator WATKINS. In your judgment, there would be not very many who could qualify?

Representative JUDD. I think that is right. Relatively, the proportion would be small.

Senator WATKINS. But in spite of that, you think we ought to make some provision for them anyway, giving them an equality of status?

Representative JUDD. I do. Of course, I think that the percentage of literate people in this group of refugees is higher than the general percentage among the general Chinese population. I mean, these refugees are mostly people of stature, or they would not have left all they have and braved all the dangers and the hazards and assumed the risks of nothing at the end except possible starvation, in order to escape from communism. That very fact itself shows that they are people of quality.

Senator WATKINS. Now, in a provision in the bill that might include them, would you go so far as to break it down, so many in Korea, so many Chinese, so many Japanese, and all down the line, or would you just class them as Asiatics?

Representative JUDD. I would put it: People who are refugees or escapees, as we did in the Kersten amendment. What does it say here in the bill? It speaks of "persons who during or after World War II have left Russia or other Communist dominated or occupied areas of Europe." Just add "or Asia." That would solve it.

Senator WATKINS. What about the Japanese?

Representative JUDD. Well, they are not refugees.

Senator WATKINS. I know they are not refugees. If we keep it strictly to a refugee problem, there might not be any offense to the Japanese.

Representative JUDD. That is right. That is my recommendation, that it ought to be kept to these folks who are refugees or escapees from communism. I do not think, sir, you can handle population pressures this way.

Senator WATKINS. I realize that, and I think the President realizes it. We know this is not a solution. At best it can only be an example to other people who have far more facilities for settling people and permitting them to colonize than we have. I think that is one of the main objectives, to show to them that in this emergency we are willing to take this number of people, and in that way we are in a better position to urge them to go all out as far as they can in taking people into a country that is not yet developed.

Senator WALKER. I would like to make one observation, Doctor. I think it is fair to say that the people I represent would be much more satisfied with this bill could they be assured that they would have some people who could help us in the agricultural area. Because as you remember, I believe in 1948 we had the displaced persons. They came to our farms, and they stayed a very short time, and they soon went back to the larger cities, where their languages were spoken. But the Chinese, in the history of our area, were pioneers in the agricultural field there, and were happy there.

Representative JUDD. And they have never caused trouble where they have been. They are not wanderers. They get a place to work, and they are happy to stay there all the rest of their lives working that soil, as they did in their homeland. I had not made bold to suggest that, but I certainly think if the committee and the Congress are of a mind to do it, it would be a wise thing both from the standpoint of overall foreign policy involved and the standpoint of meeting needs in this country.

Senator WELKER. It seems to me that for the vast majority of the working common people that you have in Asia, in China particularly, it would be of tremendous psychological effect to say that our people would not only grant aid to intellectuals but also to the common workingman, who would have a chance to help himself and help us.

Representative JUDD. It would help enormously. The reason we started out limiting it to the intellectuals was because (1) a private organization could not take on any more than that, and (2) the intellectuals, so many of them, are the product of our own efforts, our own universities out there and our own universities here. It does not make any sense to spend hundreds of millions of dollars through scholarships and missionary work to produce these superior people and then allow them to be destroyed or to starve to death. We are trying to save the best among those that we have ourselves trained and developed, and who are completely committed, not in words, but by deeds, to our side in this world struggle.

But if we bring in some qualified farmers and workers, even small numbers of them, it is bound to have a great effect; so that the United States is not, as the



Communists would say, just capitalist colonialism and Wall Street imperialism, but interested in laboring people, too.

Senator WELKER. I think our people would be much more interested in this bill than they are now if that were included. I shall probably talk to you further about that matter. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Doctor. We appreciate your coming over, and I think you have made some very helpful suggestions.

Representative JUDD. Thank you.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will now hear from Mr. L'Heureux. He is here at our invitation. He is an expert in his line, probably the greatest in the world. Anything he cares to say we will be glad to hear.

**STATEMENT OF HERVE J. L'HEUREUX, SUPERVISING CONSUL  
GENERAL, BONN, GERMANY**

Mr. L'HEUREUX. My name is Herve J. L'Heureux. During the past 8 months I have been supervising consul general at Bonn, Germany, for all of Germany. I am stationed at Bonn as a member of the staff of HICOG, on Dr. Conant's staff, and I supervise the consular offices in Germany, including Berlin.

Prior to my going to Germany last October, I was Chief of the Visa Division in the State Department for 5 years. I was brought home on consultation 2 weeks ago to discuss certain problems in Germany. While I knew that displaced persons legislation was being considered, I had not seen any of it, and I did not expect to appear before these committees, but being in town I came up on the Hill to visit some old friends, and the first thing I knew I was before the Senate committee, and now I am here.

I have been in the Foreign Service 27 years, and I daresay that 23 or 24 years of that time has been devoted to visa work.

It has always been my position that an administrative officer, one who implements immigration laws, should not have any decided views, at least publicly expressed, concerning the merits of immigration legislation, because if he does express himself too strongly, or if he has very decided views, then he is embarrassed in the administration of the law because persons will say that because he was for or against it he is not doing the job he should. So I have always tried to be as frank as I could be with Members of Congress and give them my views, but not take any determined side on the substantive matter involved.

You all know that the President of the United States wants this legislation. There are political considerations for it. One is to alleviate a certain amount of human misery. Another is psychological warfare. There is always danger in persons crossing a frontier, whether they are American citizens or whether they are aliens. The more aliens that cross our frontiers the greater the danger because they have no allegiance to the United States, and the more you take from behind the Iron Curtain the greater the danger. So it is up to the Congress to decide to what extent it wants to take a chance to accomplish the purposes the bill has in mind.

Mr. WALTER. When you say "take a chance," do you mean by that there is no way of telling who are these people who are recent arrivals in Germany?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. There is some way, but let me cite as an example. When I visited Berlin on my first inspection last December, the

consul said, "I have a lot of cases here of persons who have come from behind the Iron Curtain in the past 2 to 6 months, or the past year. They have been screened here by our investigative agencies and we find nothing against them. On the other hand, we cannot get any record of their behavior, their conduct, before they came. What should I do?"

I advised the American consul in Berlin to examine such an applicant on different occasions, go over the same ground, inquire about his relationships, the places that he has worked, where he has been to school, where he has lived, and go over that ground several times, 2 or 3 times, until he is satisfied the fellow is telling a factual story.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. L'Heureux, what about police records and the ability of our people to have access to them of resident, or former residents of the Eastern Zone of Germany?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. It is not possible to obtain the police records of persons in the East Zone.

Mr. WALTER. It might well be then that people who would be inadmissible to the United States because of the commission of serious crimes could very easily and simply say, "I was never convicted of a crime." We would have no way of telling and we would admit people in violation of the law; is that not possible?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. That is a possibility; it is a probability.

Mr. WALTER. Let us go a step further. These recent arrivals apparently were secure in the section of the world known as behind the Iron Curtain for a number of years. It was not until recently that they decided they wanted to move. If that is the fact, and I believe it is, can we not safely conclude that up to the time they left they were active Communist Party members?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not think that is true, Mr. Walter. It is possible, of course, but the average person just does not want to pull up roots and leave his home. There is always hope that springs eternal, and some have stuck it out as long as they can, and they find that it is absolutely unbearable, and they break and come across. I do not really think that if the Communists want to plant spies they are going to use this means of doing it. I do not say that they would not, but I do not think it is the most effective way of doing it because once you put them through our visa procedure you have them screened, and you examine them and fingerprint them. They must have some contacts over here; they must have sponsors.

Mr. WALTER. What contacts or sponsors?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. What is envisioned here is they must have contacts, they must have sponsors before they can come over.

Mr. CELLER. The welfare organizations will sponsor them?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. They will have to get individual sponsors. The welfare organizations might procure them. But before a consul may issue a visa under the House draft, if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the person is inadmissible or excludable, he withholds the visa under the terms of the Immigration and Nationality Act. You go further here and say, in addition to that, the alien must come forward with affirmative evidence to satisfy the consul entirely that he is not excludable. Then after that he must satisfy the immigrant inspector that he is admissible. So, you have two separate agencies of the Government that are going to pass on him.

Knowing the consuls as I do, I do not think you are going to get very many aliens who have recently come from behind the Iron Curtain who will qualify. We are leaving the door open to take care of the exceptional cases. There will no doubt be exceptional cases. I doubt but that a very small number of those who have come out in the past 6 months, a year or 2 years, from behind the Iron Curtain, will be able to qualify under the drastic legislation.

Mr. WALTER. That is due entirely to the fact there is no way to determine who they are, what they are, what their connections have been, and whether they are past criminals or not.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. That is true. When you get a case like the Polish aviator, or some other dramatic case where there is a large interest that arises in this country, our intelligence agencies think that would contribute a lot to our national interest, and that it is to the national interest to bring them in, but there will be relatively few that will get in under those circumstances.

Mr. CELLER. I am curious to know, summing up what Mr. Walter said, why there has been such a great stepup of numbers of the so-called refugees from behind the Iron Curtain going from East Berlin to West Berlin. We have had a sudden avalanche from December on.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. As I understand it, economically, it is getting worse and worse in East Germany. The people are not getting as much foodstuffs. They are dissatisfied with the economic conditions. They have been oppressed. Right now the Soviets are making a gesture toward them, but the people are filled up; they are on the verge of just rebelling.

Mr. CELLER. Have the numbers increased much? Have there been more in June than in May and more in May than in April?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not know exactly. There has been a considerable increase in the past 6 months. I think the high month was early in the year, January and February.

Mr. WALTER. You say because of the unrest and dissatisfaction they are moving?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Do you not think that we ought to add to this unrest and dissatisfaction by keeping them there where they will continue to spread their dissatisfaction and add to the difficulties the Commies have in governing that section of Germany? You see, if we take the explosive part away, then we are defeating the very thing we hope will occur.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not think this legislation is going to encourage large numbers to come out. I think if they come out it is because they want to come out. It would not be with the idea of coming to America. The person that you induce to come would be the person like the Polish aviator who takes a big risk.

Mr. WALTER. Just a handful?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. A handful.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is most of these expellees hope there will come a day when they return to their home country?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I think that is true. As I see this thing, it is essentially psychological. We are not closing the door to them. We are saying "if you can qualify, but the requirements are very rigid.

There will be very few of you that will be able to succeed; but, if you want to try, you may. We do not arbitrarily say that if you risk your life when you come out that you cannot go to America." If we find a case where our intelligence agents do believe a person will contribute something here because of his knowledge, and we want to give him a haven, it is possible.

Mr. WALTER. If that is the fact, this legislation is not necessary, because the German quota is current. Everyone of these people who was born in Germany would come under the German quota, no matter whether they are behind the Iron Curtain or not.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. So far as the persons born in Germany are concerned, that is true. It is not true of the Rumanians, the Czechs, or the Hungarians.

Mr. CELLER. Of the number who are streaming over to us in Berlin, are there more Czechs than Rumanians, or are they mostly Germans and Russians.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not know.

Mr. CELLER. I found a great many Czechs, but mostly Germans. I do not know what the proportion was. That was in December.

Mr. WALTER. The largest number moving from East Berlin into West Berlin are Germans; is that not the fact? Over 90 percent of them are.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I think that is true, but I do not know exactly. I have not seen the figures.

Mr. WALTER. They would all be eligible for admission under the existing law, which brings to my mind this question: If we are to enact temporary legislation, would it not be better to add temporarily to existing quotas the numbers spelled out in many of these bills, principally the Celler bill of last year, and have the people screened and bring them within the purview of existing law instead of enacting special legislation?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. You would have to enact special legislation anyway.

Mr. WALTER. But only with respect to the availability of the numbers. There are two things that I am principally disturbed about: One, under the Displaced Persons Act, we had a deadline with the result that down near the end of the program there was that frantic attempt to get people so that we did not get the kind of people we wanted. Worse than that, when the clock struck 12 there were 7,000-plus people who had everything except the consul's stamp affixed to their papers to leave. Now, by not having this 2-year deadline and making the numbers available, they can be used at any time, and the whole program will be administered in an orderly fashion. If there is no machinery set up and existing machinery is used, then there would not be the temptation on the part of the people temporarily employed to bring pressure on the State and Justice Departments along certain lines. That is what I have in mind when I say, would it not be better to make numbers available within the framework, distributed within the framework of existing law?

Mr. CELLER. How long would you make the term?

Mr. WALTER. I would leave it wide open.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. Do you mean that so long as there is a qualified demand you would use the available quota numbers, and then if there

is a greater qualified demand than quota numbers available, you would tap the extra numbers without any limitation at the date?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. There is an advantage in that. On the other hand, I doubt if Congress would just want to leave the door open for X number of years.

Mr. WALTER. What is the difference if it is X number of years, or 2 years.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. There isn't as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WALTER. Two hundred and forty thousand in 2 years would be no different from 240,000 in 20 years. If it were 20 years, more care could be exercised in the selection.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. It is going to take a considerable period of time before you can get this thing in operation. In the first place, we would have to increase our personnel. The investigative agencies would have to increase their personnel. You would have to go out and recruit. You would have to screen those that are recruited. You would have to indoctrinate them. Once the cases arrive in the hopper then there are the investigations. I would say that it would be 6 months to a year before you could really get going on this operation.

Mr. WALTER. Would you have a time limit? You have 1 year in which to move 240,000 people, and you will find everybody scrambling around frantically to get ships and people to load them. You will have the same thing that happened in the DP program. One day 2 ships unexpectedly popped up at New York City and hundreds of people had to be put in New York hotels at \$10 and \$15 a day.

Now, as you say, if it would take 8 months to recruit the people, and I think you are right about that, why, if we carry out my idea, could not some people be moved right along? The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration is now functioning.

Mr. CELLER. You would add these additional numbers to the quota?

Mr. WALTER. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. There would be no limitation in time at all then?

Mr. WALTER. You see, here is what it says:

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, a number of special-quota visas not to exceed 240,000 may be issued to aliens in the following categories, and to their spouses and their unmarried children under 21 years of age, including adopted children and step-children who are accompanying them, if they are found to be eligible to enter the United States for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. CELLER. Do you not do that under section 3 of the committee print?

Mr. WALTER. No, I do not think you do. Under the committee print, it says, "except as specifically provided in this act."

Mr. GRAHAM. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I think that you have greater security under the Senate committee draft and the House committee draft than under any immigration legislation in our history. Now, the consul, since 1924, has been able to withhold a visa if he knows, or has reason to believe the person is inadmissible. That presupposes that he has some knowledge of some kind. Now, there can be a great deal of pressure by voluntary agencies, sometimes by a Member of Congress.

Why not give him a visa? You have nothing against him except the fact that he has come from behind the Iron Curtain. You cannot presuppose that everybody that comes from behind the Iron Curtain is subversive? Therefore, you "do not have the reason to believe" within the meaning of the act. Now, Congress in this legislation says, over and above the normal provisions: "Do not believe the alien that comes forward until the consul is entirely satisfied with affirmative evidence." That removes the pressure. The consul is the last judge.

Mr. CELLER. That does not change the basic law?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. No, only in connection with these cases here.

Mr. CELLER. Do you think that there should be a time limit, and if there is, should it be extended beyond 1955?

Mr. GRAHAM. The President asked for only 2 years.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I may be criticized for making this statement, but my experience through the years has been that it takes a long time to get something like this started. The minute the legislation is enacted the pressure starts. It will frustrate the consuls' efforts to get going because they have to answer inquiries. So the longer the period of time you can give the consul to get started, the better.

If you have 3 or 4 years to work out the program, or 5 years, there will not be that pressure to get started immediately. I think that we ought to have 6 months before we are required to issue a visa under this.

Mr. WALTER. Why should not a visa be issued under the 6 months' period?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. You can under the normal immigration law. You could under this within the limit of our ability.

Mr. WALTER. The existing machinery can function immediately, as I see it, if you do not set up another agency.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. That is true.

Mr. WALTER. That is my argument entirely.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. All I can say is that this is feasible and it is workable. The policy question is for your determination. Looking at it from my point of view, it is feasible, and you will have more security than you have under any existing or previous legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. L'Heureux, making due allowances for differences of opinion between members of the committee and yourself, you consider it a good bill? Do you care to express yourself on that?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I think the bill is an excellent bill.

Mr. BESTERMAN. Mr. L'Heureux, as you go through this print you will see that there is a residence deadline for everyone of those various groups. The person who would be eligible under this bill would have to be present in the specified geographical area here defined, on the date of enactment. Do you think that is good or bad? In other words, should this legislation be an open invitation for more to come in after it is enacted? Are you for that or against it?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. That is a policy question. The President does not want a cutoff date so far as people are concerned coming from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WALTER. Who are these people? What Communist Party did they belong to just before they came over the line?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not know.

Mr. WALTER. Does anyone know? Is it possible for anyone to know?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I assume that the intelligence people over there, the Germans and the Americans together, can probably figure out. We must have agents behind the lines, too. I do not know. I am just not competent to answer.

Mr. WALTER. Our agents are not going to testify because by doing so they would expose themselves and their effectiveness would be destroyed.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. But they are going to help us administer this. In other words, the consul might have a case that he is satisfied with. Then he would turn it over to the intelligence agency for a written report. From then on the intelligence agent does his work. If it takes 2 years for him to come in with his report, we would not touch it until he comes in with the report.

Mr. WALTER. Don't you think that the expellee and the refugee and the surplus population problems should be separated? They are three different problems.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. They are three different problems, but I cannot see why they cannot be lumped together. We are not really helping to solve the surplus population problem. It is a friendly gesture to the powers that are befriending us today and certain commitments have been made. I know that Mr. Adenauer in Germany would be exceedingly pleased. It does not mean that we have to meet that 240,000 at all. But if this legislation were passed it would be a friendly act.

Mr. GRAHAM. You understand that we are all driving toward a possible adjournment date along about August 1 and probably the administration is very anxious to have this bill put through and passed.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. That is true. If I continue as supervising consul general in Germany I will coordinate the consular activities in Germany. It may be that the Department will extend that to all of Europe. I am not after that extra work. It is not going to mean anything to me in take-home pay, just a few more headaches. I will be perfectly willing to take it on because I think that I have the feeling of Congress. I think that I know what you people want.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think you are right.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. It is my aim to give you that. I think that I have the confidence of my colleagues because I have been at this so long. I think that I can do a better job than having another agency superimposed. Leave us alone in our field and let the immigration people take care of it in their field. You would have the independent judgment of two separate agencies guided by your policy.

Mr. WALTER. I have just been handed a slip that came from Hamburg dated June 29, 1953. It is one of the foreign broadcasts that we monitor. This concerns a refugee meeting. It says:

The annual meeting of the Central Association of Expelled Germans at Dinkelsbuehl today demanded from the Government undelayed allocation of the funds provided in the equalization of burden projects. It further demanded that the Government not encourage immigration of German farmers.

Could that be the reason why there was 600 unused German quotas at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. I do not think so. The only reason why you have a surplus of quota numbers in Germany now is because the

consul has not received sufficient assurances of support for the applicants, or they have been unable to qualify under the security provisions of the immigration law.

Mr. WALTER. That is right. I think that is the reason.

Now then, this legislation contemplates the admission of people without any affidavits of support; does it not?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. They have to have job assurance.

Mr. WALTER. So, under this legislation we are admitting people who would not be admissible under the existing code because under the code they must have affidavits of support. Under this legislation assurances of a job which may last a day, or a week, or forever.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. Affidavits of support are not required by law. The consul must be satisfied that the alien is not likely to become a public charge.

Mr. WALTER. Does not somebody post a bond?

Mr. L'HEUREUX. We have not used that in any case yet. There is a provision in the Immigration and Nationality Act to post a bond in case the consul reaches a finding the alien is likely to become a public charge, but that is not used. Prior to the Immigration and Nationality Act, under the Immigration Act of 1924, with few exceptions, if a person had assurance of employment in the United States he was excludable as a contract laborer under section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917. So in order to qualify as a person who is not likely to become a public charge, he had to have means of support of his own, or assurances of support from relatives and friends, and from that evolved the system of requiring affidavits, assurances, in the form of affidavits. The Immigration and Nationality Act did not require affidavits as such. It only continues the 1924 act with requirements that the alien establish that he is not likely to become a public charge. But he may, in order to establish that he is not likely to become a public charge, submit a job assurance, which he could not do before, so there is no one who may come in under this act, except so far as numbers are concerned, who could not come in under the other act. But some persons who can come in under existing legislation could not come in under this new legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Time is running out. Are there any other questions before we allow Mr. L'Heureux to go?

May I say that we do appreciate your coming up. You have been a wonderful help to us. We value your opinion because we all consider you to be the outstanding man in this field. We want you to know it.

Mr. L'HEUREUX. Thank you very much. Your remarks have been most generous. When I come up to the Hill, and particularly before this committee, I feel friendliness. I thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 a. m., the committee adjourned.)